The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

Volume VI, Number 1

January, 1944

Published by

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON, D. C.

47588

V.6
1944

CONTENTS

Divino Afflante Spiritu 3

The Demonology of the Old Testament 6
Rev. Michael J. Gruenthaner, S.J., S.S.D.

The Chronology of St. Paul 28
Rev. Gilmore H. Guyot, C.M., S.T.L., S.S.B.

The Messianic Ideas of Jesus' Contemporaries 37
Rev. George E. Ganss, S.J., Ph.D.

Tolle, Lege 53
Rev. Matthew Schumacher, C.S.C., Ph.D., LL.D.

"Ergon" in the Gospels 61
Rev. James A. Kleist, S.J., A.M., Ph.D.

The Gospel of the Epiphany 69
Rev. Edward J. Hodous, S.J., S.S.D.

Jerome against Jerome 85
Rev. Patrick Cummins, O.S.B., S.T.D.

A Discussion of Gen. 4:7 91
Rev. Edward A. Mangan, C.Ss.R., S.S.L.

Missal Epistles from Romans, XIII 94
Rev. Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

Obscurities in the Latin Psalter, XXI 99
Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.

Correspondence 104

Biblical News 110

Survey of Periodicals 112
Rev. Patrick W. Skehan, S.T.D.
Rev. John P. Weisengoff, S.T.D., S.S.L.

Book Reviews 118

The Book of Isaiah, Edward J. Kissane. WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S.J. 118

The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim, Vol. III, W. F. Albright. E. A. CERNY, S.S. 125

Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known through Literature, James Pritchard. E. A. CERNY, S.S. 125

The Apostle, Sholem Asch. JOHN E. STEINMUELLER 126

Aventures Apostoliques, Les Actes des Apôtres, Laval Laurent. W. J. GALUS, C.M. 128

DIVINO AFFLANTE SPIRITU

The fact that the Holy Father has published an encyclical on biblical studies amid the overwhelming anxieties of the international situation cannot be surprising to our readers. This encyclical is a logical complement to the Papal pronouncement on the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. Mankind, bleeding from so many wounds, cannot be saved unless it is incorporated in the Mystic Body by accepting, in theory and in practice, the doctrine on faith and morals promulgated by Jesus Christ. This doctrine is partially contained in the sacred writings of the Old and New Testaments. The right and duty to interpret the doctrine of the Scriptures authentically belongs exclusively to the teaching authority of the Catholic Church. But throughout the ages her Popes and her Bishops have always encouraged the private reading of the Bible as an efficient means to apprehend and appreciate the personality and teaching of Jesus Christ, provided that this reading is conducted under the guidance of and in submission to the authority of the Church. The advantages accruing to priests and laity from perusing the Bible under these conditions have been ably explained by Leo XIII in the *Providentissimus Deus* and need no further elaboration here.

In addition to enforcing the directives of Leo XIII, the present encyclical possesses a unique interest. Published under such critical circumstances, it is a most significant tribute to the spiritual power and beauty of the written word of God. It is the voice of Peter proclaiming to a stricken world that it may find healing for its gaping wounds and consolation for its bitter anguish in the sacred writings treasured and expounded by the Catholic Church. Almost involuntarily, we are reminded of the impassioned invitation of Isaias in similar circumstances:

"All you that thirst, come to the waters, yea come, you that have no money;

Buy and eat, come, buy without money and without price wine and milk.

Why will you spend money for that which is not bread and your labor for that which does not satisfy?

Hearken diligently to me, and eat that which is good; and let your soul delight in abundance.

Incline your ear and come to me; hear, that your soul may live" (55:1-3a).

One other noteworthy fact emerges from the published summary of the encyclical. The Holy Father encourages and lays down directives for the scientific study of Scripture. This will afford consolation to those Catholic scholars who labor in philology, ancient history, archeology, and kindred subjects to discover and bring out the exact meaning of the text. Their toil does not always meet the appreciation which it deserves. They perform a task analogous to that of the scientist in the present war; just as his experiments provide the food and munitions which make victory possible, so the investigations of the scriptural scholar furnish the weapons which the pastor of souls must use if he is to perform his duty creditably in a skeptical world.

We are in dire need of a continuous influx of biblical scholars if we wish to maintain our position in the scientific world of America. The laborers are relatively few. May many of our talented young priests be fired with the ambition to make the sacrifices necessary for the scientific study of the Bible! May our Bishops and the Superiors of our religious congregations not forget to supply the recruits necessary for this noble enterprise!

The members of the Catholic Biblical Association have every reason to be grateful to Divine Providence and to the Sovereign Pontiff for giving us this renewed incentive to the popularization and scientific study of the Sacred Scriptures. The editors of the Quarterly are resolved to publish the text of the encyclical together with an adequate translation. Plans have already been made by the executive board of the Association to secure the utmost possible publicity for this Papal document.

Meanwhile, the secretary of the Association has cabled an expression of its gratitude and homage to our Holy Father, Pius XII. The message which he sent and the reply which he received, conferring a Pontifical blessing upon the Association, are too important to merit only a passing notice. To give them the prominence and the emphasis which they deserve we subjoin the text of both:

POPE PIUS XII
VATICAN CITY, ITALY
PLEASE ACCEPT THE PROFOUND GRATITUDE OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA FOR ENCYCLICAL DIVINO AFFLANTE SPIRITU AND THE ASSURANCE THAT WE SHALL LABOR ZEALOUSLY TO BEING THE KNOWLEDGE OF GODS WORD TO MANKIND

JOSEPH LILLY, SECRETARY

Through His Excellency Archbishop Cicognani, Apostolic Delegate to the United States, the following reply was received on October 28, 1943:

APOSTOLIC DELEGATION
WASHINGTON, D. C.
HOLY FATHER PROFOUNDLY GRATEFUL INSPIRING MESSAGE REVEREND JOSEPH LILLY IMPARTS APOSTOLIC BLESSING ALL MEMBERS CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION ZEALOUSLY COOPERATING DIFFUSION PAPAL DIRECTIVES IN RECENT ENCYCLICAL

CARDINAL MAGLIONE

This Pontifical blessing is particularly welcome and opportune at the present time, when the first fruits of the revision of the Old Testament are about to be given to the public. It will encourage the toilers to complete the long and arduous task which they have set for themselves. These words of recognition from the highest authority in the Church will inspire us to undertake the other ambitious but eminently necessary projects envisaged by the Association.

Our work has, undoubtedly, struck a responsive chord in the Catholic population of America. We have reason to be pleased with the notable support which we have received from the hierarchy, the priests, the religious, and the laity. It is also true, however, that the number of our friends could be considerably enlarged. This applies, especially, to the Quarterly. We hope that it will gain an ever increasing circle of readers among the priests and religious of America and that they will assist us by their advice and their active cooperation to make it a truly effective medium for the diffusion of scientific and popular knowledge of the Scriptures.

THE DEMONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

REV. MICHAEL J. GRUENTHANER, S.J., S.S.D.

It will be advantageous to recapitulate the teaching of the New Testament concerning the demons before investigating the doctrine of the Old relating to them. We shall then know precisely what we mean by demons and what, consequently, we are searching for in the Old Testament. We shall not cite all the texts bearing on some particular point but only a number sufficient to illustrate and prove each statement.

In the New Testament the term commonly used to designate spirits hostile to God and man is *daimonion; daimon* is employed but once (Mt. 8:31). These Greek words were already used in this sense by pre-Christian Jewish writers of the post-exilic age. They borrowed the terms from the later Greek philosophers, who employed them in a slightly different sense, to denote intermediate semi-divine beings, either good or bad.

The demons, then, of the New Testament are unclean, evil, malignant spirits (Mt. 8:16; 12:43; Mk. 1:23; 3:11,30; 5:2,13; 7:25; 9:17; Lk. 6:18; 7:21; 8:2; Acts 5:16; 8:7). They are, in fact, angels who have fallen from their high estate through sin, in consequence of which they were consigned to the everlasting flames of Hell (Mt. 25:41; 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6). At times, however, they are permitted to roam about the earth (Lk. 8:31; 1 Pet. 5:8); they dwell in the air (Eph. 2:2; 6:12), in desert places (Mt. 12:43; Lk. 11:24), near tombs (Mt. 8:28; Mk. 5:2; Lk. 8:27); they are not averse to inhabiting such unclean animals as swine (Mt. 8:31; Mk. 5:12; Lk. 7:33). The demons are principalities and powers with superhuman endowments, and their sway extends over the whole world (Eph. 6:12).

Their ruler is called: Satan (the Adversary, Mt. 4:10; Rom. 16:20 etc.); Beelzebub, or Beelzebul, after the Philistine god of flies (Mt. 10:25; 12:24,27; Mk. 3:22; Lk. 11:15,18,19); Beliar (Perverseness, worthlessness, 2 Cor. 6:15); the devil (ὁ διάβολος, the accuser, the calumniator, Mt. 4:1 ff.; 13:39; etc.); the prince of the demons (Mt. 9:34); the prince of this world (Jn. 12:31); the prince of this age (2 Cor. 4:4); the great dragon, the ancient serpent, the seducer of the whole world (Apoc. 12:7,9; 20:3). He was a murderer from the beginning, he is a liar, and the father of lies (Jn. 8:44).

Satan is utterly opposed to the kingdom of God. He puts obstacles in the way of those who preach the Gospel (1 Thess. 2:18). He is the Tempter par excellence (1 Thess. 3:5), and exerts all his ingenuity to seduce men to sin (2 Cor. 2:11). Even the most sacred persons are not immune from his solicitations (Mt. 4:1 ff; Jn. 12:2,27; Lk. 22:31). To achieve his evil designs, he will, if necessary, transform himself into an angel of light (2 Cor. 11:14). He receives divine worship when men adore idols (1 Cor. 10:20). But God does not permit men to be tempted beyond their strength (1 Cor. 10:13); He has provided them with efficacious means to overcome the wiles of Satan (1 Pet. 5:8; Jas. 4:7; Eph. 6:11,16).

The demons not only endeavor to injure men spiritually but also physically. They take possession of men's bodies and afflict them with various ailments (Mt. 12:22; Mk. 9:20; Lk. 9:39). Jesus had absolute dominion over the demons, whom He expelled at will during His lifetime (Mt. 4:24; Mk. 1:34); and He granted this power to His disciples and to His Church (Mt. 10:1; Lk. 10:17; Acts 5:16). At the last judgment Satan and his cohorts will be publicly and solemnly condemned to remain in Hell forever (2 Pet. 2:4; Jude 6).

THE OLD TESTAMENT

We are now in a position to search for analogous ideas in the Old Testament. Its demonology will be discussed under the following headings: (1) The Serpent, (2) Satan, (3) Fallen Angels, (4) The Demons, (5) Particular Demons. Our purpose is to analyse all the texts pertaining to these topics and to point out any development in revelation which may have occurred. We shall confine ourselves to the canonical books; the Apocrypha will receive only passing consideration.

1. THE SERPENT

The Serpent who plays such a sinister part in the fall of our first parents is the first principle of evil which we encounter in the Bible. Every move which he makes and every sentence which he utters betrays the cunning with which he is credited (Gen. 3:1). He judges correctly that Eve is more susceptible to direct solicitation to sin than Adam. He foresees astutely that the less accessible Adam can be reached effectively through the cajoling voice of his wife. The opening question which He addresses to

Eve is provocative. He pretends to be an inquirer who has vaguely heard of an amazing precept of God. His question may be understood in two ways: "Did God really say, you shall not eat of any tree of the garden"? or "Did God really say, you shall not eat of every tree of the garden"? Eve understood the question in the former sense and felt that an explanation was necessary. Accordingly, she replied: "Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we may eat. But of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden—God said, 'You shall not eat of it nor shall you even touch it lest you die'" (Gen. 3:2,3). Seeing that the mind of Eve was so permeated with the divine command, the Serpent feared that a direct invitation to transgress might meet with a repulse. He saw that her fear of death and her trust in God must first be undermined and that eating of the forbidden fruit must be pictured as the key to a supreme good. In accordance with these considerations he framed his reply: "You will not die at all; for God knows that on the day when you eat of it your eyes will be opened and you will be like God in knowing good and evil." The Serpent, therefore, accused God of lying and of envy, and promised Eve a knowledge equalling that of the omniscient God and transforming its possessor into the likeness of God.

The response of the Serpent manifests the utmost hatred for God and man. It is an attempt to dethrone God in the heart of His creatures, by inciting them to rebellion; at the same time it is an effort to destroy these creatures, body and soul. What success he achieved with his blasphemous deceit is narrated in the sequel and does not concern us here.

The author does not explicitly define the character of the tempter beyond telling us that the Serpent was the shrewdest animal in paradise (Gen. 3:1). He does not mean, however, that the Serpent was endowed at creation with a subtle intellect and persuasive speech. For he tells us that man alone was created to the image and likeness of God, that all the animals were completely subject to man, and that none of them was a satisfying associate for man (Gen. 1:26-28; 2:20). This precludes the possibility that the author considered any of the animals as having been created rational. Nor can we assume that the Serpent was created by some other power distinct from the true God. This is philosophically objectionable. Moreover, God is said to have made all the animals (Gen. 1:24,25; 2:19); the Serpent is ab-

solutely under the dominion of God, and there is no trace of dualism in the Old Testament.

Only two other suppositions are possible. The first is that an extraneous evil intelligence invaded paradise soon after creation and took possession of the irrational serpent which he found there to use it as an instrument of seduction. The surpassing shrewdness, therefore, which Genesis ascribes to the animal must have been due to the intelligent agent who controlled it. How this agent produced the speech which seemed to issue from the mouth of the reptile cannot be ascertained. He could hardly have used the oral organs of the serpent, for they do not seem to be adapted to the purpose.

The second supposition is that an intelligent being hid himself beneath the guise of a phantom serpent, a sensory illusion having the semblance of a serpent, which he produced. It is true that the Serpent is declared accursed among the animals, but this does not prove that he used the instrumentality of a real animal. The curse may have associated him with the animals, because by his phantom disguise he had chosen to be like them.

We cannot suppose that Eve merely imagined the words of the Serpent on seeing his phantom form, so that the latter was no more than an occasion of temptation, without producing the illusion of speech. It is difficult to understand how the mere sight of the Serpent could have excited such a train of thought in the mind of Eve. In that case she herself would have been the cause of her temptation, whereas Genesis attributes this directly to the Serpent. Finally, this theory does not harmonize with the text, which postulates some form of conversation between Eve and the tempter.

The divine inquiry after the fall reveals further characteristics of its instigator. Adam and Eve are interrogated as to the cause of their transgression, but no question of this kind is addressed to the Serpent. The curse pronounced upon him shows that this omission is due to the fact that he was deemed incorrigible.

For the sake of clearness we shall divide this curse into three parts and consider each part separately. Because the second and third parts present unusual difficulties of interpretation, we shall quote them in the original text.

The first part reads: "Because thou hast done this thing, thou shalt be accursed among all the cattle and among all the beasts of

the field. Thou shalt crawl upon thy belly and thou shalt eat dust all the days of thy life" (Gen. 3:14).

These words may be directed to the intelligent cause of the temptation and may not refer to the instrument at all, whether this was a real animal or only a phantom. If it was a phantom, this assumption is the only reasonable one, for it seems absurd to apply the terms of this curse to an illusion. Even if a real animal was used, the words need not necessarily be referred to it. For nothing compells us to think that the animal must have been cursed also.

If, then, this part of the curse refers only to the tempter, the crawling movements and the eating of dust to which the Serpent is condemned must be metaphorical, signifying contempt and humiliation. Licking the dust is a figurative expression for abject submission in the Old Testament (Isa. 49:23; Mich. 7:17; Ps. 72:9). Eating dirt has a similar meaning in the Tell Amarna tablets.

Some of those, however, who hold that the serpent was real apply these words exclusively to the animal. They think that it was cursed because it became the instrument of sin. But they differ widely in their interpretation of the curse. Some think that the serpent was a reptile with feet and that it was deprived of them in consequence of the fall. Others believe that it moved more erect before the fall. Still others are of the opinion that the animal lost none of its characteristics and that these became a curse to it as a result of its co-operation in sin.

But if the crawling movements and the dirt which it absorbs were natural to the serpent, how could they ever become a curse? This is not easy to grasp. Perhaps these peculiarities of the serpent identified it after the fall as having been the tool of the evil spirit and so made it hateful to mankind. In view of these difficulties, it is easier to suppose that the words refer entirely to the principal cause.

Let us now consider the second part of the curse upon the Serpent:

וְאֵיבָה אָשִׁית בֵּינְךָ וּבֵין הָאִשָּׁה וּבֵין זַרְעֲךָ וּבֵין זַרְעָהּ

"And enmity will I put between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed" (Gen. 3:15a).

These words cannot refer wholly or even simultaneously to the animal. That God should urge mankind to wage an incessant

warfare on serpents is senseless. This would suppose that all species of this reptile are injurious, which contradicts right reason, experience, and Genesis itself, which declares that everything that God made was good. Consequently, this part of the curse must apply exclusively to the tempter. He is metaphorically described as a serpent on account of the disguise which he assumed.

For a full understanding of the text a detailed examination of the words is unavoidable.

איבה is put at the head of the sentence to emphasize the idea which it enunciates.

האשה (the woman) must be Eve; this conclusion is practically irresistible, since this is the sense of the term in the immediate context: vv. 1,2,4,6,12,13,16. But according to the Fathers Eve prefigured the Blessed Virgin; the word, therefore, may contain a tacit reference to the Mother of God.

רע (seed) denotes posterity in a physical sense (Gen. 7:3; 13:16; Isa. 14:20 etc.). It is, also, used figuratively to define a group of persons possessing the same moral attributes, whether good or bad, although they are not considered as being united by the bond of descent from a common ancestor (Prov. 11:21; Isa. 1:4). Hence the seed of Eve is her posterity, which includes Christ in a pre-eminent sense. Since the Serpent is incapable of procreation, his posterity consists of all those who espouse his cause and in some sense acknowledge his leadership. From the New Testament we know that these are other demons. Men dominated by his spirit may be included. Thus Christ calls the unbelieving Jews children of Satan (Jn. 8:44).

It is the divine will, therefore, that enmity should exist between Eve and her posterity on the one hand and between the evil spirit and his posterity on the other. Consequently, the principles of God are said to be forever irreconcilable with those of the Serpent. From another standpoint the statement contains a message of hope for Eve and her descendants. The friendship which Eve had contracted with the evil one by assenting to his suggestion need not be permanent. She and her posterity can and should become enemies of the tempter. Since enmity towards him is friendship with God, it is implied that they can and should become friends of God.

We shall now take up the third part of the curse:

הוּא יְשׁוּפְךָ רֹאשׁ וְאַתָּה תְּשׁוּפֶנּוּ עָקֵב

The meaning of the verb שׁוּף, which is used twice in this passage, is not clear. It occurs in two other texts of the Old Testament. In Job 9:17 it may be rendered by *to pant, be eager for, to aim at,* or by *to bruise, crush;* either rendering gives a good sense. In Ps. 139:11 it seems to signify *to oppress.* Accordingly, three translations of the portion of the curse quoted above are possible.

(1) "It (the seed of the woman) shall crush thy head and thou shalt lie in wait for its heel." This is essentially the translation of the Vulgate, with the exception that it erroneously refers the pronouns to the woman instead of the seed. St. Jerome, evidently, thought that a serpent could not be imagined as bruising the heel of a human being. Hence he adopted a double rendering for the verb.

This version cannot be rejected as illegitimate. It represents the seed of the woman as gaining an absolute victory in its warfare with the Serpent. Whether the heel of the seed will be struck by the Serpent is left undecided. It is a matter of common knowledge that to crush the head of a serpent is to deal it a mortal blow. This does not necessarily mean that the life of the evil spirit will come to an end; it may simply signify the overthrow of his deceitful dominance over mankind.

How this has been achieved we gather from the New Testament. The seed of the woman is primarily Jesus Christ, who by His Redemption gained an absolute triumph over the Serpent. All those who have been saved from the wiles of the Serpent in the Old or New Dispensation attained this state purely through the grace merited by the Redemptive acts of Jesus Christ; hence they are intended secondarily by the seed of the woman.

(2) "It shall crush thy head and thou shalt wound it in the heel."

The second form of שׁוּף is rendered somewhat differently from the first on the ground that a serpent cannot properly be said to crush or to bruise and that some such sense as *wound* or *strike* is demanded by the situation described. It cannot be denied that this is a probable meaning of the passage.

The interpretation will be the same as in the first, with one difference. The posterity of Eve does not emerge unscathed from

the conflict with the powers of evil. The wound which it sustains is not mortal; it is not inflicted in a vital spot and the Serpent is not said to be venomous. The wound represents the sufferings which Christ had to endure to achieve the Redemption and the manifold afflictions which His followers must bear, directly or indirectly, at the hands of the evil spirit if they wish to overcome him.

(3) "It shall aim at thy head, and thou shalt aim at its heel."

This translation pictures the seed as directing a fatal blow at the Serpent and the latter as attempting an attack upon its heel. The result of the conflict is not stated, but it is implied. If the aim of the seed is not deflected—and there is no indication in the text that it will be or that it will not reach its object—the head of the Serpent must inevitably be crushed, although the heel of the seed may be struck. Obviously, the interpretation of this version will be substantially the same as that of the preceding ones.

The text translated as above cannot mean that the seed and the Serpent will be forever poised for battle, without striking a blow or that they will be forever in conflict, without decisive results. This would be condemning mankind to a futile gesture or to a vain endeavor. It contradicts both the New and the Old Testaments, which show that men can be victorious over the forces of evil.

Genesis, therefore, supplies us with enough evidence to determine the character of the Serpent. He is a spirit, because he is invisible; He is evil, because he is the antithesis of God and all his friends. Men are urged to wage an incessant warfare upon him; the nature of this conflict is not defined, but we may infer from the deceit practised upon our first parents that it will center about spiritual values. A horde of evil beings assists him in his warfare upon mankind. We are not told who they are, but since they are said to be his seed, we conclude that they are in the main evil spirits. His campaign will end in disaster for himself; the overthrow of the leader involves the ruin of his followers. There can be no doubt, therefore, that the Serpent must be identified with the devil, a murderer from the beginning, a liar, and the father of lies (Jn. 8:44), the great dragon the ancient serpent, the seducer of the whole world (Apoc. 12:7,9).

The evil spirit is not represented elsewhere in the Old Testamnt under the guise of a serpent. Leviathan is frequently mentioned but he is not endowed with demoniac attributes. The

name appears to be derived from Canaanite mythology. Tablets and fragments of the Baal Epic discovered at Ras Shamra describe the victory of Anath, the sister of Baal, over a series of monsters and dragons, among whom Lotan (Leviathan) is mentioned.[1] These are personifications of the forces of primeval chaos and not demons.

The popular mind apparently considered Lotan to have been a dragon. For this reason it became a name for the crocodile in Job (3:8; 40:25–41:26) and for some such sea-monster as the whale in Ps. 104:26.

Leviathan, the fleeing serpent, and Leviathan, the tortuous serpent of Isa. 27:1, are metaphorical designations for the oppressors of Israel whom God will overcome. The expression are derived from Canaanite sources, where they denote monsters of the primitive chaos.[2] Similarly, Egypt is symbolized by dragons and Leviathan in Ps. 74:14.

The Saraph serpents which attacked the Israelites in the desert with fatal results (Num. 21:6) are thought to be demons by Oesterley.[3] But this is unwarranted speculation. The supposition that were called "fiery" because they had an inflammatory bite or because they had flame-like markings on their skin satisfies all the requirements of the text. Moreover, God commanded Moses to make a bronze serpent upon which all those suffering from the bite of the fiery serpents were instructed to look, in order to be healed. This serpent is also called a Saraph; hence he must have been a reproduction of a fiery serpent (Num. 21:8). God would hardly have made a miraculous effect dependent upon the honor paid to the image of a demon.

Isaias twice speaks of a flying Saraph in conjunction with other names for serpents (14:29; 30:6). This suggests that he is not speaking of a demon. Moreover, his symbolism can be adequately understood, without recurring to the theory that he is thinking of a demon.

Procksch,[4] following the lead of others, is persuaded that the Seraphim of Isaias' inaugural vision have snake-like bodies

[1] Wm. F. Albright, *Archaeology and the Religion of Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1942), p. 90.

[2] E. J. Kissane, *Book of Isaiah* (Dublin: Brown and Nolan, 1941).

[3] W. O. S. Oesterley, *The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period* (London: SPCK, 1941).

[4] Otto Procksch, *Jesaia I* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1930).

(6:1 ff.) If this were true, we might argue that the Hebrews also conceived their demons to be serpentine in form. The text is silent about the bodies of the Seraphim. But they are said to stand (v. 2); they have feet (v. 2), hands (v. 6), and a face (v. 2). The obvious inference is that their form also is human.

The only argument for the alleged snake-like figure is based upon their name, which resembles that of the fiery serpents (Num. 21:6). But similar names may have widely divergent significations. The precise derivation of the word *Seraphim* in not known. It may have some connection with the root שׂרף, which means to *burn*. If it has, this may be due to the fact that their function resembles that of fire; they are to burn away the impurity of sin by executing divine judgments upon the guilty. Consequently, the name may signify, "Those who burn away." In fact, one of the Seraphim does touch the lips of the prophet with a glowing coal to demonstrate symbolically the removal of his sin.

2. SATAN

As we have seen, the teaching of Genesis on the Serpent leads logically to the conclusion that an evil, superhuman being exists intent upon the physical and spiritual ruin of mankind. The question naturally arises: Did the Hebrews actually ascribe their bodily and spiritual ills to this cause?

The first approach to this doctrine is commonly found in an episode which happened during the reign of Achab (873-854) and is recounted in 1 Kgs. 22:1-23. Micheas, the son of Jemla, convicts the fraudulent prophets of the kind of deceit by relating a vision of God. He saw the Lord sitting on a throne, surrounded by His heavenly court. The Lord inquired, "Who will deceive Achab that he may go up and fall at Ramoth Galaad?" After various proposals had been made, a spirit came forth and offered to deceive Achab. When asked to outline his plan, he replied, "I will go forth and be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets." The Lord approved of his plan and commanded him to execute his enterprise.

This vision is purely imaginary and symbolic. The truth of this is apparent from the fact that Yahweh is represented as sitting upon a throne and as deliberating with His court. Hence the presence of the lying spirit in heaven, his proposal, and his mission are fictions designed to inculcate a lesson suitable to the

occasion on which Micheas was speaking. Like all Israelites, Achab believed that Yahweh was the supreme cause of all things; hence he argued that the oracles of his false prophets must come from God. The vision teaches him in a vivid, dramatic way, adapted to his preconceptions, that Yahweh may also permit false oracles to be proposed in His name.

Consequently, the most that we can deduce from this vision is that the Hebrews believed in evil spirits and that these acted only with divine permission. It is even doubtful whether an evil spirit is meant here at all. The lying spirit may only be a personification of all the various erratic impulses which impelled the prophets of Achab to utter false oracles.

The prologue to the Book of Job introduces us to a preternatural character who is called השטן, the adversary, *the satan*. The use of the article shows that the word is not a proper name here, although it became such at a later period of Jewish history. It is a title designating the function which this personage exercises in the history of Job. Since he is introduced without explanatory remarks, he seems to have been a character already well-known to the readers of the book.

Two scenes of the prologue have a direct bearing upon our theme: in both Yahweh is presiding over an assembly of his angels, and the adversary appears among the angels on each occasion. It is not said, however, that he is one of them.

In the first scene, Yahweh praises the surpassing virtue of His servant Job. The adversary, however, manifests a cynical attitude: he attributes Job's virtue to self-interested motives. He suggests that Job will curse God if he is deprived of the material prosperity which he has hitherto enjoyed. With divine permission he despoils Job of all his property and his children, with the anticipation that he will apostatize. But, despite the gravity of his misfortunes Job remains loyal to Yahweh (1:6-22).

In the second scene, the adversary still refuses to acknowledge the unselfish fidelity of Job: he now claims that Job's integrity will collapse if his body is afflicted. Thereupon Yahweh allows the adversary to strike Job with a grievous disease (2:1-7).

The two scenes are purely poetic dramatizations of the idea that God permits calamities to enable men to give an example of virtue. At the same time they show that the adversary exists and that he is not merely an angel who accuses men when they have sinned. He is undeniably evil: he imputes wicked motives

to others without cause and he afflicts men with the most appalling calamities to induce them to curse God and so prove his evil suspicions. In this respect he presents a sharp contrast to Yahweh, who permits men to suffer that they may demonstrate their virtue.

The satan or the adversary reappears in the post-exilic prophecy of Zacharias. The seer beholds the angel of Yahweh; Josue, the highpriest, is standing before the angel, and the adversary is at the right hand of Josue in order to accuse him (3:1). The accusation of the adversary is not quoted nor are the sins of Josue recited by anyone else. Without an explanatory preamble, the angel of Yahweh addresses threatening words to the adversary: "Yahweh rebuke thee, Satan! May Yahweh, who has chosen Jerusalem, rebuke thee! Is not this a branch plucked from the fire?" (3:2).

As the context shows, Josue represents the Jews who have returned from the exile: they are "the branch plucked from the fire" (Am. 4:11). Yahweh is resolved to save this remnant, to rebuild Jerusalem, and to make it once again the capital of His chosen people. The adversary is opposed to this plan. For this reason the angel implores Yahweh to rebuke him. But Yahweh rebukes when He threatens with punishment. This is the force of גער, *rebuke*, in other passages of the Old Testament when it is applied to God; Isa. 17:14; Nah. 1:4; Ps. 9:6; 68:31; 106:9; 119:21.

The adversary, therefore, cannot be an angel deputed to act as a prosecutor. An angel could not be opposed to God nor could he incur the divine displeasure in any manner whatever.

In Zacharias, then, the role of the adversary is similar to that which he plays in the prologue of the Book of Job. He appears as the greater opponent of Yahweh in the vision of the prophet, because he is threatened with the divine wrath, which is not the case in Job. He seems to be less of an enemy of mankind in Zacharias, because he is apparently only insisting on justice: the punishment of the Jews for their sins. Implicitly, however, this involves not only their physical but also their spiritual ruin: they are to be deprived of all the material and spiritual blessings promised to the chosen people. As in Job, therefore, the adversary desires that men become hostile to God.

Neither Job nor Zacharias represent the adversary as inciting directly to sin. This occurs in 1 Par. 21:1, where Satan is said to

have instigated the unfortunate census by which David offended God. In 2 Sam. 24:1 the Lord Himself is said to have impelled David to this act, because the divine wrath was enkindled against Israel. The Jews, therefore, at a period of their history subsequent to the age of Job and Zacharias, realized that certain acts which they formerly attributed to the permission of Divine Providence, without definitely knowing their finite causes, were due to the intervention of Satan. At this time, also *the satan* had ceased to be an appellation and had become a proper name: Satan is used without the article in 1 Par. 21:1.

Ben Sira (*ca.* 200 B.C.) knows that Satan tempts men to sin. He declares that cursing Satan after sin has been committed is tantamount to cursing oneself. He implies that man has the power to resist and is to blame primarily if he yields. Ecclesiasticus does not treat Satan as a proper name but transliterates the familiar title by ὁ Σατανᾶς (21:27).

The Book of Wisdom (*ca.* 100 B.C.) recognizes the influence of Satan more strongly than any of its predecessors. It identifies the tempter of paradise with Satan and warns that he is the author of death and that they will experience it who belong to Satan (2:24). By death it understands the loss of eternal beatitude (cf. 1:16; 2:20). In this passage (2:24) διάβολος is used without the article, showing that among the Greek-speaking Jews of Egypt the title had become a proper name.

The Greek word διάβολος primarily means a slanderer. But in the Septuagint it is used to translate השטן found in the prologue of Job, in Zach. 3:1, and in 1 Par. 21:1. Through the influence of this version it became a designation of Satan in the New Testament.

Summing up our discussion of Satan, we may say that the later books of the Old Testament exhibit him explicitly as a tempter, whilst the earlier books do so implicitly. Whether this is significant of a real progression of thought we are unable to say. Perhaps the earlier Jews were just as conscious of his activity in the domain of sin. Our documentary evidence is too meager to permit a dogmatic statement on this point. Nor are we able to decide when the idea of Satan arose. If the pre-exilic books are silent on the subject of Satan, this does not prove that the concept was unknown. The argument from silence is precarious; it supposes that the witnesses should necessarily have spoken of some topic had they been familiar with it. There may

have been many reasons why the pre-exilic books did not mention Satan.

All the sacred writings depict Satan as evil, so that we cannot say that the notion of Satan evolved from that of an angelic prosecutor transformed into a slanderer and author of sin. All the characteristics of Satan are already virtually contained in the Serpent of paradise. The Jews needed no outside influence whatever to conceive his personality. It is frequently asserted, however, that the demonology of the Persians affected the conception of Satan.[5] He appears in post-exilic books and the post-exilic Jews were in contact with the Persians and could have been influenced by this people.

Even if we admit that the Book of Job is post-exilic—which is far from certain—the differences between the Persian and Jewish religions on the origin of evil are too fundamental to suggest more than a slight, accidental influence. Satan is completely under the domination of Yahweh; he cannot create anything, nor can he perpetrate any evil, physical or moral, without the sanction of Yahweh. The Persian religion divides the world into two distinct empires, each of which is ruled by an absolutely independent god. Ahura Mazda (the all-wise lord) reigns over all that is physically and morally good; Angra Mainyu (the destroying spirit) rules over all that it is the contrary, and is not responsible to anyone for his actions. It is only at the end of the world that Ahura Mazda will overcome Angra Mainyu. The latter is the cause of all evil; he created the demons who are the authors of sin and all that is filthy and ill-smelling in this world.

It is clear, then, that the idea of Satan could not have been borrowed from the Persians. They may, however, have stimulated the Jews to form the concept of the adversary from elements which they themselves already possessed in their own religion.

3. FALLEN ANGELS

According to the New Testament Satan and his demons are angels cast into Hell because of some sin (Mt. 25:41; 2 Pet. 2:4; Jude, 6). It is natural, therefore, to inquire whether this doctrine is duplicated or at least foreshadowed in the Old Testament.

[5] For the protagonists of this view cfr. König, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 3d and 4th ed. (Stuttgart: Belser, 1923) p. 231 note 5.

The Book of Job suggests that some of the angels may have lapsed into sin (4:18; 15:15). But it does not identify them with demons nor does it say that they are forever condemned.

An obscure passage in Isaias may have some bearing on the subject:

24:21. "And it shall come to pass on that day: Yahweh will visit
The army of the height on high
And the kings of the earth on earth.
22. And they shall be gathered like prisoners in a pit,
And they shall be imprisoned in a prison
And shall be punished because of the long past."

"On that day" refers to a great catastrophe described in the preceding section (24:1-20). The army of the height on high defines some kind of celestial potentates: this is indicated by the phrase and by the contrast with the kings of this earth. Both classes of rulers are to be punished by imprisonment. Fischer[6] and Feldman[7] think that the stars are meant by the army of the height on high. But how can they incur guilt and how can they be imprisoned? König[8] thinks of the guardian angels of empires, but these are confirmed in grace. It is possible, then, that the deities are meant who, in the opinion of the ancients, inhabited or were symbolized by the stars. Thus the Babylonians assign the sun to Marduk; Mercury, to Mabu; Sirius, to Ninurta; Mars, to Nergal. A Hittite tablet on which the stars are invoked is extant.[9] Hence if the army on high denotes the gods of the Gentiles, they must be conceived as demons, for Isaias admits of no other god besides Yahweh (43:10; 44:6,8, etc.). The texts, then, states that these demons will one day be judged and condemned to imprisonment. We may argue that these demons must have been morally good at some time in their existence, for no being is created in the state of depravity. But we cannot prove without the aid of the New Testament that they are fallen angels. We cannot show by the Old Testament alone that they belonged to the same class of beings whom we find at the court of Yahweh in the prologue of Job or in the inaugural vision of Isaias (6:1 ff.).

An argument for the lapse of at least one Cherub is sometimes

[6] *Das Buch Isaias I* (Bonn: Hanstein, 1937).

[7] *Das Buch Isaias I* (Münster in Westf.: Aschendorff, 1925).

[8] *Das Buch Jesaija* (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1926).

[9] Alfred Jeremias, *Handbuch der Altorientalischen Geisteskultur* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1929), pp. 372-380.

based on some verses from Ezechiel's dirge over the prince of Tyre (28:14-16).[10] God says to the prince:

14. "Thou wast the Cherub extended and covering,
And I placed thee on the holy mountain of God;
In the midst of stones of fire thou didst walk.
15. Blameless wast thou in thy ways from the day that thou wast created,
Until iniquity was found in thee.
16b. And when thou didst sin, I expelled thee as profane from the mountain of God,
And I destroyed thee, O covering Cherub, from the midst of the stones of fire."

It is argued that the prince of Tyre is compared to a certain Cherub, who was in a state of primitive innocence and happiness, and that the future degradation of the prince of Tyre is likened to the expulsion of this Cherub from his condition of beatitude. The conclusion is drawn that some Cherub who was elevated to a supernatural state was deprived of it as the result of transgression.

Unfortunately, both passages in which the Cherub is mentioned are not quite intelligible and are corrupt. Instead of "Thou wast the Cherub extended and covering etc." (v. 14) we should probably read with the Greek: "With the Cherub I placed thee, thou wast on the holy mountain of God." In place of, "And I destroyed thee, O covering Cherub" (v. 16), the Greek has the more acceptable reading: "And the Cherub destroyed thee from the midst of the stones of fire." These variants show that the prince of Tyre is in reality being compared to Adam in paradise. Under these circumstances the passage cannot be used to prove the fall of a Cherub.

Nor can the sons of God who married the daughters of men be fallen angels, as the Jewish Apocalyptists thought. This has already been amply discussed and refuted in this review.[11]

4. THE DEMONS

When discussing the Serpent we learned that he was the ruler of a brood of evil beings hostile to God and man. Can we find any other evidences of this belief among the Hebrews? Leviticus

[10] Blasius Beraza, *De Deo Creante* (Bilbao: Elexpuru, 1921), pp. 305-308.
[11] Donat Poulet, "The Moral Causes of the Flood," 1940, pp. 293-303.

commands the Hebrews in the desert to slay their animals for sacrifice at the entrance to the Tabernacle (17:1-6). The purpose of this ordinance was to keep the Israelites from going out into the deesrt and slaughtering these animals in honor of the Seirim (שעירים; 17:7).

This cult persisted for centuries among the Israelites. Jeroboam I (929-909) appointed priests to serve the Seirim (2 Par. 11:15). Josias (638-608) tore down the highplace sacred to the Seirim in Jerusalem (2 Kgs. 23:8). Leviticus pronounced the cult to be apostasy from Yahweh and threatened its votaries with extermination (17:4,7).

From the name, which means *hairy ones* or *goats,* we conjecture that the Israelites imagined them to be goat-like in appearance or in their attributes; hence, for want of a better name, they may be termed satyrs. We do not know whether they had some objective reality or existed only in the mind of their worshippers; in either supposition they were demons, for their cult was abhorrent to Yahweh.

Isaias describes Seirim as dancing in ruined Babylon and as calling to one another in a desolate city (13:21; 34:14). Both references occur in poetic passages. Sacred poetry inculcates truth, but its imagery need not be founded on objective fact. Hence we cannot conclude from these texts that the Seirim existed in some form or other. Isaias is merely using the popular superstitions of his contemporaries to paint a picture of horror. Baruch, however, states unequivocally that desolate Babylon will be the abode of demons (4:35). The *daimonia* of the Septuagint in Isa. 13:21; 34:14 shows that the Alexandrian Jews considered the Seirim to be demons.

The Israelites also worshipped the Shedim (שרים). Not only did they sacrifice to the Shedim but they even immolated their sons and daughters to them (Deut. 32:17; Ps. 106:37). The Song of Moses terms the Shedim no-gods, the antithesis of the idea of God.

The name is similar to the Assyrian *Shedu,* which denotes tutelary deities or genii, apparently regarded as inferior to the gods properly so called, and subordinate to them. They seem to be represented by the bull-colossi stationed at the entrances of Assyrian palaces.

It is not clear from the Psalm (106:37) or from Deuteronomy (32:17) whether they equate the Shedim with the foreign gods

or whether they intend a special class of beings distinct from these gods. If they are identified with the gods, the latter are said to have been demons: idol-worship is condemned as equivalent to demon-worship. In a similar way St. Paul shows that taking part in the sacrificial feasts of the heathens involves having fellowship with demons (1 Cor. 10:20). The same idea is already contained in the Septuagint, which renders *shedim* and the Hebrew word for idols in Ps. 96:5 by *daimonia.*

If the Shedim are considered distinct from the gods, they are declared to be demons in the Psalm and Deuteronomy. This is true even if they existed only in the imagination of their worshippers and even if the latter did not explicitly conceive them as evil.

Another indication of the widespread belief in demons prevailing among the Israelites is furnished by the diviners, enchanters, sorcerers, and charmers whom Deuteronomy proclaims abominable to the Lord (18:10 ff.). In Babylonia the rites used by the men and women engaged in these pursuits were frequently concerned with demons. It is probable, then, that the same was the case in Israel.

5. Particular Demons

Since there are no other references to the demons as a class in the Old Testament, we shall now discuss the individual evil spirits who are actually or allegedly mentioned there. In Jdgs 9:23 God is said to have sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the citizens of Sichem. Now, the Hebrew word for spirit (רוח) may designate a state of mind or of the emotions; it does not necessarily denote a personal agent. Hence the sense of the passage in Judges may be that God permitted a feeling of hate to rise between Abimelech and the Sichemites.

A similar line of reasoning applies to the so-called diabolic possession of Saul. After his repeated disobedience to divine commands the spirit of God departed from Saul and he was troubled by an evil spirit from the Lord (1 Sam. 16:14). On one occasion, when Saul was thus afflicted, he prophesied. His act is described by the Hithpael of נבא showing that in speech or in gesture or in both he acted like a prophet, i.e., like a man under preternatural influence. At this time, also, he made his first attempt on the life of David (1 Sam. 18:10). On previous occasions David had

calmed Saul's ravings by his skilful playing on the lyre (1 Sam. 16:23).

The fact that Saul behaved like a prophet does not prove that he was possessed. Recurring attacks of depressive mania would account for these symptoms as well as for the murderous hate of David. Consequently, the evil spirit from the Lord, as in the case of Abimelech, may denote some mental disturbance permitted by God. In this supposition, it is easy to understand how Saul could obtain some relief from music. How this could influence a demon is difficult to grasp.

On the Day of Atonement two goats were set aside as a sin-offering: one for Yahweh, the other for Azazel. The latter was brought before the highpriest, who, laying his hands upon it, confessed the sins of Israel over it. After having been thus symbolically burdened with the people's transgression, the scape-goat was led forth into the desert and set free for Azazel (Lev. 16: 1-23).

Some deny that Azazel is a proper name. Connecting it with the Arabic root, *azal, to remove,* they interpret the word as meaning complete removal. The sense of the ceremony would then be that the goat was sent into the desert for *azazel,* i.e., to signify the complete removal of sin.

But in Lev. 16:8 the goat for Yahweh is contrasted with the goat for Azazel. Since Yahweh is a person, this suggests that Azazel too is a person. The goat is sent out to him, because the desert is deemed a fit abode for a sin-laden goat and Azazel is considered a proper associate for such an animal. Azazel, therefore, is most probably a demon. Both the Old and the New Testaments teach that evil spirits sojourn in the desert (Lev. 17:1-7; Mt. 12:43). In the extra-biblical Apocalyptic literature Azazel is one of the chief fallen angels.[12]

Another demon expressly named in the Old Testament is Lilith (לילית). Isaias depicts her as reposing in the ruins of a city laid waste by God (34:14). Her name may be of Babylonian origin. There was a Babylonian god bearing the Sumerian name Lilu, who had a handmaid called ardat Lili or Lilitu, who was apparently a winged demon. In the rabbinic literature Lilith is a nocturnal demon, dangerous to children and parturient mother.[13]

[12] Alfred Jeremias, *Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Alten Orients* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1930), p. 442.

[13] Jeremias, *op. cit., Handbuch,* p. 142; *Das Alte Testament,* p. 684.

It is preposterous to think that Isaias believed in female devils, even if we prescind from the legends which his contemporaries may have connected with Lilith. Her name occurs in a poetic passage and for this reason her existence is not affirmed.

The demon who creates most problems for the student is Asmodaeus in the Book of Tobias (3:8,9; 6:15-19; 8:2,3). First of all, his name closely resembles Aeshma Daeva, the name of one of the principal fiends created by Angra Mainyu, the Zoroastrian god of evil.

It is important to note, however, that in the book Asmodaeus has nothing in common with his alleged Persian counterpart except, possibly, the name. He is absolutely under the domination of God, who disposes of him at will. Aeshma Daeva, on the contrary, acknowledges no overlord except Angra Mainyu.

Hence the author of the book may have given him his name, because he was called thus by the Jews of Ecbatana. They could easily have learned about Aeshma Daeva from their Median fellow citizens and may have ascribed the misfortunes of Sara to this fiend, who, in some respects, was similar to the demons of their own religion.

Asmodaeus, however, may not be a Persian word at all. It may be derived from the Hebrew root שמד, *to destroy*. This might explain why this demon is called שמדון, *the destroyer*, in the later Jewish literature.[14]

None of the recensions of the Book of Tobias contains the least intimation that Sara was obsessed by Asmodaeus. His power was restricted to her prospective bridegrooms. She had been betrothed to several young men in succession, but each of them was killed by Asmodaeus in the bridal chamber on the night of the wedding, so that the marriage was never consummated.

In the version of the story found in some manuscripts the younger Tobias informs Raphael that Asmodaeus slays anyone who approaches Sara, because he is in love with her.[15] Since this statement is lacking in other recensions, it may not be genuine. Even if it is genuine, it merely represents the gossip which Tobias heard from his Jewish compatriots in the course of his journey. It is not the judgment of the inspired author of the book.

[14] Meinrad M. Schumpp, *Das Buch Tobias* (Münster in Westf.: Aschendorff 1933), p. 64.

[15] Schumpp, *op. cit.*, p. 141.

The heart and the liver which Tobias was told to extract from the fish and burn in the bridal chamber give rise to another difficulty. According to the Vulgate and the Hebrew version discovered by Gaster,[16] Raphael seized Asmodaeus when the heart and liver were enkindled and bound him in the desert of Upper Egypt. This implies that the burning organs had no direct influence on Asmodaeus. We conclude from this version that the cause which prompted Raphael to intervene was the obedience of Tobias in carrying out the directions of his angelic guide (6:19).

The Vulgate, however, is not quite consistent. In 6:19 it declares "That very night (i.e., of the wedding), when the liver of the fish is burnt, the demon will be put to flight." This seems to show that the heart and liver had some effect on Asmodaeus. Hence the Vulgate reading of 8:3 may not be altogether genuine.

As a matter of fact, all the other recensions state that the demon fled to upper Egypt when he perceived the odor of the burning organs of the fish and that he was bound there by the angel. Are we to assume, then, that the fumes did affect the demon? The assumption that this was the case has given rise to some ingenious, although implausible, hypotheses.[17] We do not think that the assumption is necessary. The text declares that the demon fled when he perceived the fumes, but does not say that this was the cause of his flight (8:3). In 6:18, also, Raphael merely says that the demon will flee when he scents the odor; it does not attribute his flight to this cause. Consequently, the fumes may have been merely an occasion which God, acting directly or through His angel, used to manifest His power to the demon, causing him to flee to Upper Egypt.

The binding of Asmodaeus by the angel is not to be understood literally. From magical texts cited by Deissmann[18] it is apparent that binding is a metaphorical term denoting a restraint in activity. Asmodaeus, therefore, was confined to the desert of Upper Egypt, where he could no longer injure anyone.

But if the burning of the heart and the liver had no effect on the demon, why did Raphael prescribe this rite? The answer is to be sought in the mentality of the Near East. It was commonly

[16] Schumpp, *op. cit.*, pp. xxxviii, 142.

[17] R. Galdos, *Commentarius in Librum Tobit* (Paris: Lethielleux 1930), p. 192 ff.

[18] *Licht vom Osten*, 1st ed. (Tübingen: Mohr 1908), p. 220 ff.

thought in that part of the world that the burning of certain substances was effective in the banishment of demons. This is evident from the Babylonian tablets and the rabbinical writings.[19] Tobias must have shared the belief of his environment. Hence when Raphael, whom Tobias esteemed so highly, recommended a remedy of this kind, he was inclined to accept it.

CONCLUSION

We may now summarize the results of our investigation. The story of the fall supplied the Israelites with all the elements requisite for the development of a demonology analogous to that of the New Testament. They conceived the idea of Satan, antagonistic to God and man. Whether they evolved this concept from the paradisiac Serpent or received it in a distinct revelation cannot be decided. Satan is identified with the Serpent in the Book of Wisdom. There are allusions to the defection of some angels. Evil demons, abhorred by God and noxious to man are known, but they are not represented as directly inciting to sin. There is no reference to their leader. Neither Satan nor the demons are said to be fallen angels.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[19] Schumpp, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF ST. PAUL

Rev. Gilmore H. Guyot, C.M., S.T.L., S.S.B.

The problem of the chronology of the life of St. Paul has vexed exegetes for many centuries. In the Acts of the Apostles St. Luke is content to give indefinite statements with regard to Paul's sojourn in this or that city; in his own Epistles St. Paul alludes to places that he has visited and these allusions complicate the chronology of the Acts. The following outline is presented as the final work of a man who loved St. Paul and who spent long hours in endeavoring to unravel the entanglements of the Acts and the Epistles of Paul. That man was the Very Rev. Charles L. Souvay, C.M., Ph.D., S.T.D., S.S.D., whose death several years ago deprived the Church of a scriptural scholar not unknown, particularly in American circles. The basic dates from which Father Souvay worked will be given; then the outline will be presented, followed by remarks on specific dates in the outline.

1. Basic Dates for the Outline

A. Death of Herod Agrippa: Herod died in 44 A.D. (Josephus, *Ant.* XIX, 8, 2).

B. First Captivity of Paul in Rome: 61-63 A.D. (with the possibility of a year either way). According to Josephus (*Ant.* XX, 8, 9), the procurator Felix was brought before the Emperor Nero by the Jews, who made serious accusations against him, but he was freed at the request of his brother Pallas, the favorite of Nero. Pallas, however, died in 62, poisoned by his master, so rumor had it. Hence it was before 62 that Felix returned from Judea, and it was before that date that Festus came to Judea (Acts. 24:27). Moreover, Josephus (*Life*, 3) says that in his twenty-sixth year he went to Rome to secure the release of some of his friends—priests—who had been sent to Rome by Felix when he *was* procurator of Judea. Josephus was born in the first year of Caius Caesar (Caligula, 37 A.D.),[1] so the twenty-sixth year of Josephus coincides with the year 62 A.D. Felix then was not procurator in 62 A.D.; Festus had succeeded him, and he very soon settled the case of Paul by sending him to Rome (Acts. 25:1 ff; 27:1). Paul's departure then may be set as 60 or 61 A.D.

[1] Fr. Souvay places the date of the birth of Josephus at 36 A.D.

C. Council of Jerusalem: 51 A.D., although this date cannot be determined as precisely as the preceding ones. The first mission of Paul began shortly after the death of Herod Agrippa (44 A.D. Acts 12:24; 13:1); we may say that it began in 45. When compared with the two following missionary journeys and by reason of its importance, this mission must have lasted three or four years. Upon his return Paul "stayed no little time with the disciples" (Acts 14:27). This would give us 50-51 as the date of the Council.

Paul departed almost immediately, and in a very short time we find him in Macedonia (Acts. 15:36; 15:40; 16:12). By reason of the opposition of the Jews his stay in Philippi, in Thessalonica, and in Berea was not very long (Acts 16:12; 17:1; 17:10); nor does he seem to have tarried along at Athens (17:16; 18:1). His arrival at Corinth could not have been very long after his departure from Antioch. At Corinth Paul found Aquila and Priscilla, recently come from Italy, because Claudius had expelled all Jews from Rome (Acts. 18:1-2). Josephus is quoted (Orosius, VII, 6) as placing the edict in 49; but Josephus does not mention this edict. Claudius regarded Herod Agrippa II with great favor, hence it is unlikely that the edict was issued while Agrippa was in Rome. The absence of Agrippa coincides with the years 50 to 52;[2] hence we may date the decree during that period. Aquila and Priscilla had *recently* arrived in Corinth; Paul had not spent a year in reaching Corinth. Again the date of the Council is 50-51.

The duration of the second and third missionary journeys of St. Paul can be determined from Acts 15:36–18:22; 18:23–21:16.

Gal. 1:18 and 2:1 give us two periods, one of 3 years, another of 14 years. Hence it was 14 years before the Council of Jerusalem that Paul paid a visit to Jerusalem. He was converted three years before this visit, in 34 A.D. At the martyrdom of Stephen, Paul seems to have been at the beginning of his public life, hence 30 years of age, as the Jewish custom indicated. He, then, was born about the year 3 A.D.

For the dates following the first captivity in Rome we cannot be exact. The martyrdom may have taken places between 64 and 67, the latter date being more probable.

[2] Cf. Jos. *Ant.* XX, 6, 3; also *HDB.*, Vol. I, p. 447, Col. 1 (Claudius).

2. OUTLINE

Date	*Event*	*Sacred Scripture*
3	Birth of the Apostle	No indication
	Names of the Apostle, his race, place of birth	Acts 13:9; Rom. 11:1 2 Cor. 11:22; Phil. 3:5
	His civil rights, his education, trade	Acts 21:39–22:3 Acts 22:25-28 Acts 18:3
33	Persecutor of the Church, enemy of Christ	Acts 7:57-60; 8:3 Acts 22:3-4; 26:9-11 Gal. 1:13
34	Conversion of Paul	Acts 9:1 ff.; 22:1-16 Acts 26:12-18 Gal. 1:15-16
34	Paul goes to Arabia	Gal. 1:17
	First Preachings at Damascus	Acts 9:20-25 2 Cor. 11:32-33
37	Visit to the Apostles in Jerusalem	Acts 9:26-29 Gal. 1:18-19
	Vision at Jerusalem in the Temple	Acts 22:17-21
	Paul at Tarsus (Private Preachings (?) in the regions of Syria and Cilicia)	Acts 9:30; 11:25 Gal. 1:21
42	First sojourn of Paul at Antioch	Acts 11:24-28 cf. Acts 13:1-3
43	Second trip to Jerusalem (famine during the reign of Claudius, 41-54 A.D.)	Acts 11:30; 12:25
44	Ravished to 3d heaven (14 years before the writing of 2 Corinthians)	2 Cor. 12:2-4
45-49	FIRST MISSIONARY JOURNEY (Cyprus and Galatia)	Acts 13:1–14:25
49-50	Second sojourn at Antioch	Acts 14:26–15:2
51	COUNCIL AT JERUSALEM	Acts 15:1-31 Gal. 2:1-10
	Return to Antioch, Paul withstands Peter	Acts 15:22,35 Gal. 2:11-14
51-54	SECOND MISSIONARY JOURNEY (Galatia, Macedonia, Greece)	Acts 15:36–18:22
52	From Corinth Paul writes *2 Epistles to Thess.*	Acts 18:1-5 1 Thess. 3:1-8 2 Thess. 2:1-2; 3:17
	Sojourn at Corinth. Perhaps journey to Illyricum	Acts 18:1-18 Rom. 15:19 2 Cor. 12:14; 13:1

Date	*Event*	*Sacred Scripture*
54	Return to Orient, to Jerusalem	Acts 18:18-22
	Third sojourn in Antioch	Acts 18:22-23
54-58	THIRD MISSIONARY JOURNEY	Acts 18:23–21:16
55-57	Sojourn at Ephesus	Acts 19:1
	From Ephesus Paul writes *First Epistle to Corinthians*	1 Cor. 16:8-19
	Voyage into Macedonia. *Second Epistle to Corinthians*	Acts 20:1 2 Cor. 2:1-3; 7:5-6; 9:3-4
57-58	2d sojourn in Greece (Corinth)	Acts 20:2-3
	From Corinth, *Epistles to Galatians and Romans*	Rom. 15:25-26 Rom. 16:1-2
58	Return to Jerusalem by Macedonia and sea	Acts 20:3–21:17 Rom. 15:25-31
	Paul in Jerusalem	Acts 21:17-26
	Paul is arrested, sent to Caesarea	Acts 21:27–23:35
58-60	Captivity at Caesarea under Felix and Festus	Acts 25:1–26:32
60-61	Voyage to Malta, sojourn there	Acts 27:1–28:10
61-63	Voyage to Rome, captivity there	Acts 28:11-31
	Epistle to Ephesians,	Eph. 3:1; 4:1; 6:20-22
	Colossians,	Col. 4:7-9; 4:10-18
	Philippians,	Phil. 1:12-17; 4:22
	Philemon,	Philem. 1,2,9,23,24
	and Hebrews	Heb. 13:24
63 (?)	Paul released, voyage to Spain (?)	Rom. 15:24-28
	(Paul not in Rome in 64, Persecution of Nero)	(Cf. Clement, 1 Cor. 5)
64	Voyage to Crete (?)	Tit. 1:5
65 (?)	Voyage to Jerusalem (?)	Heb. 13:23-24
	Voyage to Asia, sojourn at Ephesus	1 Tim. 1:3
65-66	Voyage to Macedonia and to Epirus *First Epistle to Timothy; Epistle to Titus*	I Tim. 1:3; Titus 3:12
66	Return to Asia (Corinth)	2 Tim. 4:20
67 (?)	Second captivity at Rome	2 Tim. 1:8,16,18
	Second Epistle to Timothy	2 Tim. 1:8; 4:9-18
67	Martyrdom of Paul	Clement, 1 Cor. 5

3. RESULTS

To begin with there is the possibility of a year's addition or subtraction in the dates given in the outline, except for the date of the death of Herod Agrippa, which is certain. One has only to consult various authorities on the Chronology of St. Paul to

realize this; for example, Pope[3] places the conversion of St. Paul in 32-33, Jacquier[4] 34-36.

While quoting these examples, and while our minds are considering the date of the conversion of St. Paul, we shall continue with this date. The first difficulty is encountered in the Epistle to the Galatians. St. Paul asserts that after his conversion "I retired into Arabia, and again returned to Damascus. Then after *three* years I went to Jerusalem to see Peter" (Gal. 1:17-18). The three years are to be dated from the return of Paul to Damascus after a sojourn of unknown length in Arabia. When, then, did Paul leave Damascus? In 2 Cor. 11:32-33 Paul tells the Corinthians that "in Damascus the governor under King Aretas was guarding the city of the Damascenes in order to arrest me, but I was lowered in a basket through a window in the walls, and escaped his hands." Authorities[5] agree in uniting these different accounts: the date of leaving Damascus (Gal. 1:8) is that indicated by 2 Cor. 11:32-33. It is difficult to determine the beginning of the reign of Aretas in Damascus, although it is certain that he was dead by 40 A.D.; it is improbable however that Aretas had control of Damascus before the death of Tiberius, 37 A.D. In this case the date of Paul's departure from Damascus must be between 37-40 A.D.

In the same epistle to the Galatians (2:1) Paul gives another indication of chronology: "Then after fourteen years I went up again to Jerusalem with Barnabas, taking also Titus along with me." The first point to be cleared is: what is the starting point of the fourteen years? Is it the flight from Damascus or his return from Arabia? Did Paul return to Jerusalem fourteen years after his return from Arabia? In the first case we would count seventeen years from his conversion, in the second fourteen years. Father Souvay in his outline considered the return to Jerusalem as seventeen years after the conversion: there are two periods, he says, one of three years, one of fourteen. However, it is well known that there are many scholars who hold that the three years and the fourteen years have the same starting point, namely, the return from Arabia.

To complicate matters it is not certain whether the trip to

[3] Pope: *"Aids" to the Study of the Bible,* Vol. V (1926), p. 382.
[4] Jacquier: *Actes des Apôtres* (1926), p. cccliii.
[5] Pope, *op. cit.*, p. 374; Jacquier, *op. cit.*, p. ccc.

Jerusalem referred to by St. Paul in Gal. 2:1 ff. coincides with the Council of Jerusalem, which he attended (Acts. 15:1 ff), or with the journey recounted in Acts. 11:30, or possibly with some unrecorded visit. Father Souvay interprets Gal. 2:1 ff. as referring to the Council of Jerusalem; again however it must be noted that there are those who disagree.

Since Father Souvay considered the date of the Council of Jerusalem as 51, it is immediately evident that the date of the conversion was 34, since the conversion took place seventeen years before the Council.

The basis of Father Souvay's date for the Council of Jerusalem have been given under 1: Basic Dates for the Outline. To his reasonings we add a few words concerning the Proconsulship of Gallio in Achaia, in the light of the inscription from Delphi.[6] This inscription is dated "the twelfth year of his (Tiberius Claudius') tribunical power"; he is acclaimed as "imperator for the twenty-sixth time."[7] At the end is found the name of Gallio "My Friend and proconsul of Achaia." Gallio then was proconsul of Achaia in the twelfth year of Claudius, during which year the twenty-sixth acclamation took place. This coincides with the year 52 beginning Jan. 25, and 53 ending Jan. 25. By reason of the fact that the twenty-seventh proclamation of Claudius as Emperor took place Aug. 1, 52, it follows that this inscription was written between Jan. 25, 52 and Aug. 1, 52. As ordinarily proconsulships began in the spring, we may assume that Gallio was certainly at his position in the spring of 51, and most likely continued until the spring of 53.

Having determined the date of the proconsulship of Gallio, we now turn to the Acts of the Apostles (18:12-17). Paul is haled before the court of Gallio, who will have nothing to do with the case. The question arises: At what time of Gallio's tenure of office was Paul brought before him? Jacquier supposes that it was the first part of his government, hence the latter part of 51; Pope, however, refers to 52. Now, we know from the account of Paul's second missionary journey that he had been at Corinth for some time before he appeared before Gallio; most

[6] Cf. RB. 10 (1913), pp. 36-53; pp. 207-217; Jacquier: *Actes des Apôtres* (1926), pp. cclxxxvii-cclxxxviii.

[7] Pope: *"Aids" to the Study of the Bible,* Vol. V (1926), p. 377.

of the eighteen months that he spent there preceded the appearance before Gallio. Moreover, from the beginning of the Second Missionary Journey to his arrival at Corinth a period of six to ten months must be counted. Let us then say that the time from the Council at Jerusalem to Paul's appearance before Gallio is two years (with the possibility of three months added or subtracted). In this case the Council of Jerusalem would be dated 49 or 50. Father Souvay's date is 51; in the notes on the outline Father Souvay did not, however, consider this inscription; in his notes on the Acts of the Apostles he gives it his attention. He concludes that the letter should be dated in the spring of 52, that Paul appeared before the proconsul in the spring of 52. Then he summarizes St. Paul's movements from the Council of Jerusalem: a) Paul left Jerusalem in 51; b) He went through his former foundations very rapidly, in a few months, six at the most; c) he reached Corinth towards the end of 51; d) he appeared before the proconsul in the spring of 52; e) he left Corinth probably in 53. Thus he reconciles his previous date of 51 for the Council of Jerusalem with the Delphic inscription.

This article would not be complete unless it included a comparison of Father Souvay's chronology with the chronologies of other scholars. The following scheme then is proposed to complete the article:

EVENT	Souvay	Prat	Ruffini	Pope	Jacquier	Simon-Prado
Conversion	34	36	34	32-33	34-36	34
First Journey	45-49	44/45-49	44/45-49/50	47-48	44/45-47/48	45-49
Council of Jerusalem	51	49	50	49	49	49-50
Second Journey	51-54	50-52	50-52/53	49-52	49-52	49-53
Third Journey	54-58	53-57	53/54-58	53-57	52-57	53-58
First Captivity in Rome	61-63	60-62	61-63	58-60	60-62	60/61-61/62
Death	67	66-67	67	67	67/68	67

The differences vary from one to three years. If we would discover the reasons for these variations it will be necessary to institute a comparison of basic dates. In the beginning of this article the three basic dates of Father Souvay were listed; these must now be compared with the corresponding dates given by the above-mentioned scholars.

EVENT	Souvay	Prat	Ruffini	Pope	Jacquier	Simon-Prado
Death of Herod Agrippa I	44	44	44	44	44	44
Council of Jerusalem	51	49	50	49	49	49-50
First Captivity in Rome	61-63	60-62	61-63	58-60	60-62	60/61-61/62

The variations in the Chronology of St. Paul as found in the foregoing scholars are reduced to two basic dates, since all of them agree with Father Souvay in placing the death of Herod Agrippa I in 44 A.D. These two basic dates will now be considered. First, the date of the Council of Jerusalem: Father Souvay gives 51 A.D., although he admits the possibility of 50 (cf. the discussion under BASIC DATES FOR THE OUTLINE, C). Father Souvay's first argument for the date of the Council of Jerusalem is founded upon the length of the First Missionary Journey, and upon the words of St. Luke in the Acts: that St. Paul after his return "stayed no little time with the disciples" (Acts 14:27). With the exception of Ruffini, who approaches nearest Father Souvay in his date of the Council, the others either shorten the time for the First Missionary Journey or do not consider the time spent by St. Paul at Antioch (Acts 14:27) as relatively long.[8] In view of the importance of this First Missionary Journey, in view, too, of the explicit words of the Acts, it would seem that Father Souvay has given a date that is more intelligible. The second argument of Father Souvay for his date of the Council finds its basis in St. Luke's account of the Second Missionary Journey (Acts 15:36–18:1), as well as in the edict of Claudius expelling the Jews from Rome. While the scholars in question agree that the journey from Antioch to Corinth was of short duration, they disagree with Father Souvay concerning the edict of Claudius. They admit that the quotation of Orosius (asserting that Josephus dates the edict 49 A.D.) is not found in the present editions of Josephus, nevertheless they accept the date; thus the edict fits in with their chronology, and specifically with their date of the Council of Jerusalem. Father

[8] Ruffini, *Chronologia Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (1924), pp. 175-184, Tabula XIX; Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul* (1938), Vol. I, pp. 397-410; Pope, "*Aids*" (1926) Vol. V, pp. 370-384; Jacquier, *Actes des Apôtres* (1926), *Introduction*, pp. cclxxxvii-ccv; Simon Prado, *Praelectiones Biblicae, Novum Testamentum*, Vol. II (1930), pp. 33-41.

Souvay however considers this date was definitely uncertain, because, as stated above, "it is unlikely that the edict was issued while Agrippa (Herod Agrippa II, the favorite of Claudius) was in Rome." Agrippa however was absent from Rome between 50 and 52, hence the edict should be dated during this interval. When Paul had arrived at Corinth, Aquila and Priscilla had *recently* come from Rome (18:1); the date would be 51 or 52. The year 49 would be too early for St. Luke to say that Aquila and Priscilla had recently come from Rome; 50 or 51 would be more fitting.

The other basic date in consideration is the time of the First Captivity in Rome. Father Souvay argues to 61-63 from the chronology of Josephus relative to the impeachment of Felix before Nero, relative likewise to a visit made by Josephus himself to Rome after Felix had been removed from the procuratorship. Ruffini comes to the same conclusion as Father Souvay, although he varies slightly in the date of the birth of Josephus and hence his visit to Rome.[9] Prat gives 60-62, although he admits that in view of the uncertainties the captivity may have taken place in 61-63.[10] And since Father Souvay himself admits the possibility of a variation of a year either way, these two authorities may be said to agree with the date given for the First Captivity in Rome. Pope differs three years from Father Souvay, 58-60; in doing so he (Pope) relies to a great extent on Eusebius, and hence the reason for the difference, as Father Souvay relies on Josephus.[11] Jacquier and Simon-Prado vary but a year from the date of Father Souvay, and since the latter admits the possible variation of a year, the difference need hardly be considered. All in all, it seems impossible to discover the exact years of the First Captivity in Rome; 60-62 as well as 61-63 have probability.

Whatever other variations are found between the Chronology of Father Souvay and those of the above-mentioned scholars may for the most part be attributed to the differences in the two basic dates discussed. Further discussion would seem to involve details that perhaps might serve more to obscure the chronology than to clarify it.

Kenrick Seminary
St. Louis, Missouri

[9] Ruffini, *Chronologia V. et N. Test.* (1926), pp. 176-178, Tabula XIX.
[10] Prat, *The Theology of St. Paul* (1938), Vol. I, pp. 409-410.
[11] Pope, "*Aids*," Vol. V (1926), pp. 377-378.

THE MESSIANIC IDEAS OF JESUS' CONTEMPORARIES

Rev. George E. Ganss, S.J., Ph.D.

I Introductory

Why did the Jews fail to recognize Jesus as the Messiah foretold by their prophets? Full half a millenium before His birth the seers of Israel had predicted the most minute details of the Messiah's life, and the very fulfillment of all these details in Jesus proved Him to be the long expected Anointed of Yahweh. Yet we are confronted by this startling fact. His own Jewish contemporaries whose very lives, like those of all their ancestors, seemed one plaintive yearning for the Messiah, failed to recognize Jesus as the Christ. When Pilate asked them to behold the man—their king—they booed Him away to the death of the cross.

Again we ask: why did the Jews fail to recognize Jesus as the Messiah? Already in the primitive Church this query formed a stumbling block.[1] How could the first Christians convince the Gentiles that Jesus was a legate of God, yea the Messiah, when Jesus' own people refused Him recognition? Today the objection is raised anew. In 1922 Dr. Joseph Klausner of the Hebrew University at Jerusalem published a life of Christ,[2] the first composed by an Israelite. The English translation alone has gone through seven editions (in 1933). On the first page of his introduction Dr. Klausner depicts his attitude as follows:[3] "We are in the presence of two facts. The first is that Jesus was born a Jew, that He lived and died in the very heart of Israel, that He was a Jew in every respect. The second is that Jesus' disciples, and their followers to an even greater extent, withdrew from Israel, or, to put it better, that the vast majority of the Jews did not accept the teaching of Jesus, opposed Him through all His life, and did not become Christians even when all the rest of the

[1] Cf. *Rom.* 9–11, and p. 134 of the article of Père J. B. Frey, C.S.Sp., "Le conflit entre le Messianisme de Jésus et le Messianisme des Juifs de son temps," *Biblica*, Vol. 14 (1933), pp. 133-149; 269-293. I am chiefly indebted to this article for the ideas contained in this essay.

[2] Dr. Joseph Klausner, *Jesus von Nazareth, seine Zeit, sein Leben und seine Lehre* (Berlin: 1930).

[3] Translation from the French of Frey, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

world embraced the new religion. Christianity was born in the heart of Israel, but Israel as a people used all its might to repulse its forces. What is the cause of this?" Dr. Klausner deems this the most important, if not the only, problem to be solved in his book. His solution, in brief, is this. Beyond doubt Jesus was a Jew. But His teaching presented in its method as well as its doctrines a deviation from Judaism, something or other non-Jewish, which was destined sooner or later to bring on the separation. In addition, there is Jesus' almost total indifference towards the sad political situation enveloping the Jewish race. Judaism itself, under pain of infidelity to its traditions, was obliged to reject both the doctrine and the person of Jesus.

Dr. Klausner's thesis is maintained by most all the Jewish scholars who concern themselves with the fact of Christianity. It appears in Dr. Dienemann's *Klausners Jesuwerk* (Breslau: 1929), and in E. R. Trattner's *As a Jew Sees Jesus* (London: 1931).

A third time we ask: Why did the Jews fail to recognize Jesus as the Messiah? The brief answer lies in the fact that the Jews had conceived a Messiah whom Jesus did not fully resemble. This essay will endeavor to show, as concretely as possible, just what this concept was, how it came to be formed, and how it led to the rejection of Jesus by the people He loved.

To understand our subject satisfactorily we must first of all recall some of the chief features of the historical, political, and social setting of the Jewish people among whom Jesus was born. Since their return from the Babylonian exile in 538 B.C. the Jews had led a harassed life in Palestine. Suffering miserably under the successors of Alexander the Great, they at length revolted under the Machabees and successfully maintained their national independence under the Asmonean kings from 135 B.C. until 63 B.C., when Pompey's capture of Jerusalem put an end to the last Jewish dynasty. Roman rule never made itself truly welcome in Judaea. But ever careful to leave subject peoples a certain amount of autonomy, Rome amply tolerated Jewish local customs and even political groups. She did not hinder intercourse of the Diaspora with the Holy City, the annual tribute, or the pilgrimages to Jerusalem. The court of the Sanhedrin, almost stripped of power under Herod, regained a goodly amount of independence. According to the guess hazarded by Père

Grandmaison the population of Palestine in evangelical times numbered nearly a million souls.[4]

Like all other peoples, the Jews were socially divided into the common people and the leaders. The populace comprised farmers, vine dressers, raisers of cattle and sheep, leisured artisans and fishermen,—true Israelites without guile from whom Jesus drew most of His disciples. Mary, her cousin Elizabeth, Simeon and Anna all seem to have come from the populace. Among the masses there were, no doubt, many God-fearing men and women, carefully observing the Mosaic law and serving God ordinarily well, but, of course—and we must note this well,—according to the ideas received from their leaders.

These leaders possessed a firmly established ascendancy over the people. After the exile the religious authorities were at the same time the political guides. The high priest, the most important man in Israel, was the nation's political chief just as much as its representative before God. The priests' need of help gave rise to the institution of scribes, whose task was to make the Torah known and observed. Because they knew its prescriptions so well they were often called upon to act as judges. Among these scribes, called in evangelical times by the coveted title of esteem, Rabbi, my Master, the two opposing parties of the Pharisees and Sadducees sprang up.

When we cast about for sources which will reveal the Messianic concepts entertained by Jesus' contemporaries, we find that the latest books of the Old Testament are practically silent about the Messiah. The New Testament indirectly tells us a good deal about the notions of the masses by showing their reactions to Jesus' teaching. The rabbinical Writings, namely the Talmud, Targumim, and Midrashim, all completed two centuries or more after Christ, are too late to be of much use to us now. But the works of chief utility in our study are the Apocrypha of the Old Testament, especially the Sibylline Oracles, the Psalms of Solomon, and the long, disjointed Book of Henoch, sometimes referred to as Henoch Literature. God is the author of Scripture, but the Jews themselves are the sole composers of these Apocrypha which, being the literature of the Israelites, faithfully reflect the thought and emotion coursing through Jewish minds from 400 B.C. to 70 A.D.

[4] Grandmaison, Leonce de, S.J., *Jesus Christ, His Person, His Message, His Credentials* (N. Y.: Sheed & Ward, 1934), Vol. I, p. 253.

Of special importance to us are the Apocrypha which contain a large Apocalyptic element, that is, which profess to present visions of the unseen world and the Messianic future. The Apocalyptic writers endeavored to take the place of the prophets, whose voices had not been heard in Israel for almost five hundred years. Just as the prophets had made use of events of the moment to console or to warn the people, the Apocalyptic writers presented now messages of comfort, now attempts to explain why the just suffered so much and why the expected sovereignty of Israel on earth was so long delayed. Under the pen names of the true prophets of old they put forth their philosophy of the origin and progress of world events. Naturally, they often depicted the Messiah of their dreams. Their portraits, varying with the political fortunes of the Jews, reveal a great flux of opinions both of the Messiah and his Kingdom. Sometimes they place his realm on a transfigured earth, with a new Jerusalem for its capital; sometimes it is lifted entirely into the heavens. The more the hope of an earthly kingdom grew dim, the more these authors looked to a kingdom of the future age (*αἰὼν μέλλων*) which was to be ushered in by the resurrection of the dead and an accompanying divine judgment of men.

It would be an error to suppose, however, that any one concept of the Messiah was common to all the Jews. Pharisees and Essenes, priests and politicians, Apocalyptical writers and scribes who studied the Torah—each group conceived a Messiah somewhat different in details. Yet certain traits common to all the divergent Messianic concepts current in evangelical times do emerge from the documents of the period.

II MESSIANIC IDEAS OF JESUS' CONTEMPORARIES

An abundance of literary documents of the last century B.C. and the very appearance of numerous Pseudo-Messiahs bear ample witness to the intense, even feverish, expectation that the Messiah was soon to come. The expected person, called[5] Messiah (משיח) or anointed (*Χριστος*) is legate of God, invested with divine authority and charged to establish the kingdom of God among men. While it had often been predicted that he would be a descendant of David, the term "Son of David" first appears in the

[5] 1 Kings 2:10; Ps. 2:2; *Ps. Sol.* 17:32; 18:5-7. The New Testament shows that the term had become common.

Apocryphal Seventeenth Psalm of Solomon (v. 21). In this same Psalm, in the Sibylline Verses, in John and Matthew he is called "King of Israel."[6] The Parables of Henoch often name him "The elect."[7] The term "Son of Man" appears in Daniel (7:13); but, strange as it may seem to us, this term which is so important for a correct understanding of Jesus' Messiahship exercised no known influence at all on the popular concepts. The expression "Son of God" is applied to the Messiah in only one passage—and this possibly interpolated—of the Book of Henoch.[8] If the Jews who lived just before the birth of Jesus ever did apply the term "Son of God" to the Messiah they applied it only in a metaphorical sense of the word "son."

Son of David, Anointed King of Israel, elected by God to fulfill a special mission, but withal a simple man,—these are notes of the Messiah's person which were entertained by all the Jews.

The Messiah's mission is variously portrayed by different classes of writers. The dream of a group of apocalyptic authors appears in the Parables of Henoch.[9] The Elect dwells in the super-terrestrial regions. Endowed with great wisdom and unlimited power, he is appointed supreme judge by God. On the day of judgment he will take his seat on the throne of his glory, and angels and men, just and sinners, all will assemble before him. Everything will be weighed in the balance. He will pass judgment on the most secret matters. Righteousness will be regarded, injustice punished. This concept presents a Messiah who is a promoter of justice. In the opinion of many it is the most exhalted notion found; but unfortunately it exerted no known influence.

The most beautiful portrait of the Messiah and His mission is that sketched in the Apocryphal Seventeenth Psalm of Solomon, composed about the time of Pompey's conquest of Judea, and reflecting the ideal most cherished both by the Pharisees and the Jews as a whole. The Asmonean dynasty suffers bloody defeat. The foreign Romans vanquish the country. The sinners, namely the Sadducees and Hellenists, are now in power. But fear not. The Messiah will come as a great liberator. A descendant of David, he will re-establish the national dynasty, banish the for-

[6] *Ps. Sol.* 17:42; *Sib.* 3, 652; Jn. 1:49; Mt. 21:5; 27:42.
[7] Cf., e.g., *Hen.* 40, 5; 49, 2; 51, 3.5; 52, 6.9; etc.
[8] *Hen.* 105, 2.
[9] Cf. Frey, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

eigners, punish the Gentiles for their pride, destroy the sinners, gather together all the dispersed Jews, purify Jerusalem from the blemishes sustained by contact with the Gentiles, and cause the ancient glory of Israel to shine again in all its splendor. Some hostile nations will be annihilated; the rest will be reduced to subjection. The victory of the Jews will be the merited retribution visited upon the pagans and the unfaithful Jews.[10] This Messiah, we see, is above all a *warrior king.*

The cries of this Jewish poet do not lose their beauty even in translation; and so touching are his heartfelt lines that it may be well to quote at least some portions of his song.

Psalm of Solomon, XVII. A Psalm. Of Solomon. W. Song. Of King.

1 O Lord, Thou art our King for ever and ever,
For in Thee, O God, doth our soul glory.
2 How long are the days of man's life upon the earth?
As are his days, so is the hope (set) upon him.
3 But we hope in God, our deliverer;
For the might of our God is for ever with mercy.
4 And the kingdom of our God is for ever over the nations in judgment.
5 Thou, O Lord, didst choose David (to be) king over Israel,
And swaredst to him touching his seed that never should his kingdom fail before Thee.
6 But, because of our sins, sinners rose up against us;
They assailed us and thrust us out;
What Thou hadst not promised to them, they took away (from us) with violence.
7 They in no wise glorified Thy honourable name;
They set a (worldly) monarchy in place of (that which was) their excellency.
8 They laid waste the throne of David in tumultuous arrogance.

The poet goes on to describe the sad condition of Israel under Pompey and the Romans and then continues:

21 For the heavens withheld the rain from dropping upon the earth,
Springs were stopped (that sprang) perennial(ly) out of the deeps, (that ran down) from lofty mountains.
For there was none among them that wrought righteousness and justice;
From the chief of them to the least (of them) all were sinful;
22 The king was a transgressor, and the judge disobedient, and the people sinful.
23 Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their king, the son of David,

[10] *Ps. Sol.* 17:21-34; 42-44; cf. Frey, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

At the time in which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over
Israel Thy servant.
24 And gird him with strength, that he may shatter unrighteous
rulers,
25 And that he may purge Jerusalem from nations that trample
(her) down to destruction.
Wisely, righteously, 26 he shall thrust out sinners from (the) in-
heritance,
He shall destroy the pride of the sinner as a potter's vessel.
With a rod of iron he shall break in pieces all their substance,
27 He shall destroy the godless nations with the word of his
mouth;
At his rebuke nations shall flee before him,
And he shall reprove sinners for the thoughts of their heart.
(Tr. Gray)

Substantially the same conception of the Messiah as warrior king appears in the Sibylline Verses, ("the king sent by God") and in the *De Praemiis et Poenis* of Philo.[11] The New Testament shows clearly that this notion of the Messiah was predominant in Palestine at the time of Jesus. The multitudes, awe-struck at the miracles of Jesus, wished to proclaim Him king (Jn. 6:15). Even after the resurrection Jesus' own Apostles, not yet freed from their tenacious prejudices, asked: "Lord, wilt thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" (Acts 1:6).

Some texts give the Messiah the role of the prophet[12] who is to interpret the will of God. The Psalms of Solomon as a whole present him with all the traits of a doctor of the law. Just one man, the author of the Testament of Levi, transfers some qualities of the Messiah promised to Judah to a descendant of the sacerdotal race. He was to be a savior by general agreement of all the Jews. But what did they mean by this term? He was regarded chiefly as a political savior; but we must not pass over the moral influence he was to have. The Seventeenth Psalm of Solomon, as we have seen, portrays him as the leader who was to make Jerusalem holy and pure and to banish all injustice from the midst of his people.

The Messianic kingdom conceived by the Jews is all in keeping with their pictures of the Messiah. These hounded people, treated like beasts at bay under the Seleucid kings, ever surrounded by prowling enemies, fallen after a brief period of national independence under the yoke of Rome and the dynasty of the Idu-

[11] *Sib.* 3, 652-656; Philo, *De Praemiis et Poenis*, 95.
[12] Cf. *Ps. Sol.* 17:40-43; 18:4-70; Frey, *op. cit.* p. 143, 144.

mean Herods, quite naturally came to think of the Messianic kingdom as the exact counterpart of the sad political situation in which they found themselves. The pagans had humiliated the people of God in every way. From the Jewish viewpoint, then, was it not to the very interest of God that the savior of His chosen people should completely turn the tables against these heathen who blasphemed His Holy Name?

Consequently, the first characteristic of the Jewish dream of the Messianic kingdom was its narrow nationalism. The Jews themselves are to be the prime beneficiaries in it. Remembering too vividly the bitter treatment they had sustained at the hands of the Gentiles, they were far from prone to admit them too readily to their own happiness. According to most Jewish writers, the Gentiles who escape bitter annihilation become completely subservient to the Israelites,[13] whose new kingdom will have Palestine as its center and Jerusalem as the glorious capital of the Messiah's empire. The writer of the Psalms of Solomon, however, gives a different picture. Many Gentiles, amazed at the Jews' happiness under their Messiah, will come from the ends of the earth to see his glory. Philo,[14] too, makes the Gentiles willingly obedient to the Jews. The best conditions ever afforded to the Gentiles are those of citizens of the second class.

A second prominent trait is the material character of the happiness expected to prevail in the Messiah's realm. After the wars exterminating or subjugating the Gentiles an idyllic peace will endure. Riches will abound, the earth will possess an extraordinary fertility, numerous children will gladden the hearts of their parents—for sterility will be no more—no one will die save from old age.[15]

When we reflect upon the concepts so far seen, we Christians are perhaps much surprised at the conspicuous absence of certain elements so familiar to our own concepts of the Messiah. First and foremost, the attribute of divinity is utterly wanting. The Jews would have shuddered at the very thought that any human, however great he might be, could share divine honors with Yahweh. The Jew Trypho voiced the sentiments of all his race when

[13] Cf. *Ps. Sol.* 17:21-31; *Sib.* 3, 702-710.

[14] *De Exsecr.*, 164.

[15] *Cf. Sib.* 3, 702-731; 751-758; 780 s; 788-795; Philo, *De Praem. et poen.* 107; 110; Frey, *op. cit.*, p. 148.

he said to St. Justine Martyr: "We expect that the Christ will be a man descended from men, *ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων*.[16]

The Jews never attributed to their Messiah the power to forgive sins. When Jesus told the man sick of the palsy "thy sins are forgiven thee," the scribes cried out "He blasphemeth. Who can forgive sins but God only?" (Mk. 2:7).

Was the Messiah of Jewish concepts pre-existent? Some Apocalyptic texts, resembling the famous vision of Daniel, show his pre-existence.[17] But all these texts can be explained to denote a pre-existence in the divine ideal order; before his birth the Messiah has a very special place in the thought of God. The fact is that rabbinical Judaism never admitted any real pre-existence of the awaited leader. The prophets, indeed, left passages which seem to us to foretell the Messiah's divinity quite clearly. Isaias spoke of the virgin who was to conceive and whose son was to be called Emmanuel, God with us. David recognized the Messiah as his Lord, seated at the right hand of the Most High, the Son begotten of God Who received the nations as His heritage (Isa. 7:14; 9:5 ff.; Ps. 109:1-2). Yet these oracles, while clear enough to us, only puzzled the Rabbis. Upon meeting passages of the Old Testament which teach the real pre-existence of the Messiah the rabbinical commentators tortured the text to avoid the natural meaning.[18] The passage in the Parables of Henoch, referred to above, is the one place where we find a real pre-existence attributed to the Messiah. But his divine nature no wise follows from this pre-existence; he is only a creature existing somewhere else for a time before he descends upon our earth.

The Jews never made their Messiah either a sovereign legislator with power to change the Mosaic law, or the bearer of a new revelation. The most he could do was to confirm the people in the observance of the Torah, whose prescriptions, especially in regard to the temple and sacrifices, were expected to remain in force forever.

The Jewish Messiah does not appear as the savior of the heathen. Earnestly as he wishes sanctity and justice enthroned

[16] *Dial.* c. *Tryph.* 49.

[17] Cf. Frey, *op. cit.*, p. 141, who refers to *Hen.* 39, 6 s; 48, 3,6; 62, 7: *Ass. Moys.* 10, 2; Septuagint: Ps. 109:3; Mich. 5:2.

[18] Cf. Frey, *op. cit.*, who refers to *Targ. in Mich.* 5:2; Dan. 7:13 ff.

in his own kingdom he nowhere does anything to bring the right conduct of life to those who have it not.[19]

The Jews took no account of the Messiah's priesthood, nor of the new sacrifice he was to prescribe. David's proclamation that he would be priest according to the order of Melchisedech would involve the passing of the priesthood from the tribe of Levi to Judah. Malachias' prophecy of a new sacrifice without blemish to be offered in all the world would afford the Gentiles equal rank with the Jews in the Messianic kingdom. Both these prophecies went altogether too contrary to Jewish prejudices to receive much attention.[20]

Lastly, the Jews did not expect a suffering Messiah, an expiatory victim who by his suffering and death was to attone for the sins of his people. Even the most expressive texts of Isaias find not a single echo among Jesus' contemporaries. Enamoured of a glorious Messiah, the Jewish interpreters had recourse to a most refined casuistry to escape the obvious meaning of the Isaian texts foretelling the sufferings of the expected leader.[21]

III THE CONTRAST OF JESUS' MESSIANIC CONCEPTS

Such, then, were the Messianic notions current in the milieu when He appeared whom we hold to be the Eternal Son of God become a man to save all men. Jesus began to preach His Messianic doctrines. His concepts, so different from those entertained by His countrymen, were certain to stir up opposition; and to speak naturally, it is small wonder that the notions He preached should have resulted in His rejection as Messiah. Jesus did not commence His ministry by publicly proclaiming Himself Messiah. To make this proclamation and to secure ready credence through His miracles would have been an easy matter for Him; but such procedure would only have excited a political revolt certain to be suppressed by the legions of Rome. His first step was to teach men the true nature of the Messianic kingdom, of which He was announcing the glad tidings.

In contrast to the material kingdom of the Jews, Jesus' kingdom is highly spiritual. He seeks internal observance more than external; the formalistic observances of the letter customary to the Pharisees must give place to Jesus' doctrine that the morality of acts proceeds from the intention of the heart (Mt.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 144, 145. [20] *Ibid.*, p. 289. [21] *Ibid.*, p. 145.

15:16-20). The end sought in His kingdom is salvation; He has come to free men from the yoke, not of Rome, but of Satan. The fruit of the kingdom of Satan is sin, and it is precisely sin which Jesus is determined to efface. That is why He shows such friendship to sinners who may repent, to the perpetual scandal of the Pharisees.

Moreover, Jesus' kingdom bears no resemblance to the narrowly national, political realm dreamed of by the Jews. As entrance requirements Jesus demands not race, but Baptism, change of heart (*μετανοεῖν*, Mk.1:15 ff.) and life led according to the high moral principles enunciated in the Sermon on the Mount. All thought of winning temporal independence for Israel and setting up again the temporal throne of David is wholly foreign to His teaching. When the multitudes wish to make Him a temporal king, He flees (Jn. 6:15).

Jesus' kingdom possesses another note which galled the Jews, universality. Adapted to all men, since all can fulfill its entrance requirements, it annihilates all importance from the distinction between Jew and Gentile. Jesus expresses admiration of the Romans centurion's faith, and of that of the woman of Canaan (Mt. 8:5-13; Mk. 7:24). He even dares to make a Samaritan the hero of one of His most touching parables. He Himself wishes to minister to the strayed sheep of the children of Israel; He will have His apostles too preach His new covenant first to them, but then they are to carry His doctrine to Samaria and the uttermost parts of the earth (Lk. 10:30-37; Acts 1:8).

The spiritual notion of the Messianic kingdom finds its reflection in Jesus' conception of the Messiah's person. To know His concept all we need do is to study His own doctrine and life, the two external expressions of what He thought. First of all, Jesus as Messiah is a spiritual leader; He is king indeed, but in a kingdom unlike the other kingdoms this world has seen (Jn. 18:36.) In the first period of His ministry He teaches, He claims that the Messianic prophesies are fulfilled in Himself, He works numerous miracles to prove His claims. When men apply Messianic titles to Him He makes no denial; yet in public, lest He stir up revolt, He never calls Himself by the popular titles which evoked in Jewish minds their own Messianic ideas, such as the Christ, King of Israel, Son of David. He uses instead "Son of

Man," the title which the Jews so seldom referred to the Messiah. Why this choice? Surely because of the stupendous truths this name could have caused them at least to suspect, had they but pondered it in their hearts. Let us hear, once again, the prophecy of Daniel where this title first appears. In his vision the prophet has gazed upon the cruel beasts representing heathen empires. He sees the Ancient of Days seated upon His throne, and he goes on: "I beheld . . . in the vision of the night, and lo, one like the son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and he came even to the Ancient of days: . . . And he [God] gave him power, and glory, and a kingdom: and all peoples, tribes and tongues shall serve him [the son of man]: his power is an everlasting power that shall not be taken away: and his kingdom that shall not be destroyed."[22] The Messiah's humanity is here portrayed, by reason of the sharp contrast to the sad condition of affairs which He was to remedy, the cruelty practiced under the four preceding beastly kingdoms. His divinity is no less clearly insinuated, and that in a manner fit to lead the Jews of evangelical times to give more careful consideration of Jesus' claims and proofs of His divinity. To come upon the clouds of heaven, take one's place beside the Most High and receive indestructible power in a kingdom which will never end—all that seems to be the prerogative of a divine being. The Title "Son of Man" which recalled this passage, gave the most synthetic concept of the Messiah's person, in so far as it foreshadowed his profoundest humility as man and his greatest glory as God.

No wonder then that Jesus chose this title, for all it implied was fulfilled in Him. First of all, He is man, and a lowly man at that, whom a haughty king of this earth would scarcely notice. He is poor, without place to lay His head (Mt. 8:20); He has come not to be ministered to but to minister (Mt. 20:28); He fully resembles other men, and like them He eats and drinks (Mt. 11:19). He is the messenger of the glad tidings (Mt. 13:37), come to save that which was lost (Mt. 18:11; Lk. 19:10). He is the Messiah who, as expiatory victim, will go to Jerusalem, suffer many things, and by His death atone for the sins of men (Mt. 20:28; Lk. 9:22). He is a priest founding a new line of priests and a new unblemished, unending sacrifice: "This is my

[22] Dan. 7:13,14. For the interpretation of the passage cf. Frey, *op. cit.*, p. 288 ff.

body, which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of me" (Lk. 22:19).

Jesus claimed, moreover, not only to be a human Messiah, but even—horror to the Jews—divine. Throughout His ministry He appropriated divine prerogatives. He insisted on His power to forgive sins. When the scribes branded His claim as blasphemy on the ground that God alone can forgive sins, Jesus forthwith performed a miracle explicitly to prove His possession of this divine power. "But that you may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (he saith to the man sick of the palsy), I say to thee: Arise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house. And immediately he arose" (Mk. 2:7-12). Jesus acted as sovereign legislator, changing at His own will precepts of the Old Law. "It was said to them of old . . . ; but I say to you. . ." (Mt. 5:21-22). He professed to speak with divine authority as the bearer of a new revelation: "But now you seek to kill me, a man who have spoken the truth to you, which I have heard of God."[23] He asserted His real, eternal, divine pre-existence: "Before Abraham was made, I am" (Jn. 8:58). He stated openly "I and the Father are one," whereupon "the Jews then took up stones to stone him" (Jn. 10:30-31), and thus inflict the punishment meted out to blasphemers. On His lips the title "Son of Man" included the meaning "Son of God." Questioned before the Sanhedrin whether He be the Christ the Son of God He solemnly affirmed: "I am. And you shall see the son of man sitting on the right hand of the power of God and coming with the clouds of heaven." "Then the high priest rent his garments saying: He hath blasphemed. . . . But they answering said: He is guilty of death" (Mt. 14:62; cf. Mt. 26:64-66). The members of the Sanhedrin must have understood Jesus to mean "Son" literally, for there is no blasphemy in claiming to be a son of God in a metaphorical sense.

The immense contrast between the Messiahship preached by Jesus and those of His contemporaries is now evident. But we still wonder: How did the Jews come by such notions? This question sends us along a rough and difficult road. Both Jesus and the Jews claimed that their respective Messianic concept were based on the Hebrew prophecies. Prophecies are almost always

[23] Jn. 8:40; cf. also Jn. 8:26-58; Lk. 10:21 ff; Jn. 10:15; 6:46; 7:28-29; 7:16; 12:44 ff; Mt. 28:18-9.

obscure before their fulfillment. Who then read them aright, Jesus or the Rabbis? Did not these very prophecies give the Jewish race reason to expect a political Messianic kingdom accompanied by brilliant temporal prosperity? Was it not Jesus who failed to fulfill the prophecies and thereby proved Himself to be only a Pseudo-Messiah?

To answer these queries we must notice that the Messianic prophecies did announce the highly spiritual character of the Messianic kingdom. All will acknowledge Yahweh. Right, justice and holiness will reign.[24] Yet it is undeniable that even from her latest prophets like Ezechiel and Jeremias[25] Israel also received special promises of a political, temporal kingdom which was often depicted in colors of extraordinary glow.

How can these passages be explained? Some part must be given to hyperbole, poetic style and the conventions of language.[26] No one gives a literal interpretation to the customary biblical reference to Palestine as a "land flowing with milk and honey,"[27] or to the statements that in Messianic times the wolf will dwell with the lamb (Isa. 11:6 ff.), that Jerusalem will be rebuilt with saphhires and jasper (Isa. 54:11 ff.). Moreover, symbolism is often employed to denote spiritual realities under the guise of material expressions, as when Jerusalem represents the Church. Lastly, the only absolute promise was that of an eternal reign of one of David's sons.[28] Contemporary exegetes still accept Bellarmine's observation that the political and temporal promises made to David and his dynasty were conditioned by the faithfulness of the princes to the law of God. The infidelity of both princes and people through the long centuries is evident. It formed the customary theme of the prophets.

We can conclude then that Jesus, in whom all the details scattered throughout the prophecies were fulfilled, who moreover proved His claim to be divine and omniscient by His numerous miracles, was not in error. Neither has His Church erred in following the interpretation of her Founder. But the Jews were led astray by reading too many of their own desires into the prophetic texts. This one fact deals a heavy blow to the very

[24] Cf. Isa. 11:9; Jer. 31:34; Isa. 1:26; 4:3.
[25] Ez. 37:21-28; 36:33-36; Jer. 23:3 ff; 30:8 ff; 33:15-26.
[26] Cf. Frey, *op. cit.* p. 284, 285.
[27] E.g., Ex. 3:8.
[28] Frey, *op. cit.*, p. 285, refers to Bellarmine, *Comm.* in Ps. 88:4; 131:12s.

foundation of Dr. Klausner's views. The "something or other non-Jewish about Jesus" was indeed something which the Jews themselves ought not to have had.

But even yet we object: why did the Jews cling to their concepts so tenaciously that even Jesus did not successfully correct their ideas and make Himself accepted as the Messiah? Briefly, because their errors, so pleasant to their national pride, had become too deeply ingrained in their hearts. They wished to see in the Messiah only a man, and they considered Jesus' claim to divinity an affront on monotheism. The prophets, especially Jeremias,[29] had frequently predicted the replacement of the old covenant by a new. But the Jews would not hear of this. Well had Isaias said of them: "For it is a people that provoketh to wrath, and lying children, children that will not hear the law of God. Who say to the seers: See not; and to them that behold: 'Behold not for us those things that are right: speak unto us pleasant things" (Isa. 30:9-10). Jesus showed little concern to speak things merely pleasant, but He presented the Jews with abundant evidence to prove His Messiahship. Besides His word, they had the testimony of the Baptist and the numerous miracles worked by Jesus Himself. "Though you will not believe me, believe the works" (Jn. 10:38). Their obstinacy was without excuse. "If I had not come, and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for their sin" (Jn. 15: 22). A last cause of the Jews' persistent refusal to recognize Jesus lay in their violent passions—national egotism, pride of race, thirst for vengeance, heartlessness towards the neighbor, desire of personal glory. They would not hear the Physician who came to heal them (Mk. 2:17). A barren fig tree, the Jewish people was definitely rejected (Mt. 21:19).

But are there no extenuating circumstances to diminish the blame laid to that race which had been so long the chosen people of God? Surely, like Jesus, we must pity the masses, put at the mercy of leaders too eager to preserve an ascendancy over the people by maintaining themselves in positions yielding money, honor or authority. Even these leaders had a respectable sentiment at the base of their political passions, sorrow at sight of the chosen people of God subject to the Gentiles who blasphemed His Holy Name. "They have a zeal of God, but not according to

[29] Cf. e.g. Jer. 31:31.

knowledge," St. Paul testifies of them (Rom. 10:2). Finally, the various traits prophesied of the Messiah are scattered throughout the Old Testament and acquire their strongest probative force only when they are combined in a synthesis. The Jews did not make this synthesis. Even if made, it would not have been accepted by the proud and learned, but only by humble pious souls like Mary, Simeon, Anna or the Apostles.

IV CONCLUSION

On a Sunday before the Pasch the people of Israel believe they possess the Messiah of their dreams. They give Him enthusiastic welcome, bestrewing the very route of His procession with palms. But Jesus sees that their Messianic ideal differs from His by all the height of heaven. He comes to them meek and humble, seated upon an ass, laden with spiritual gifts; and He knows that on Friday next, goaded by their leaders, they will clamor for His rejection: "Away with him; away with him; crucify him" (Jn. 19:15). And Jesus laments: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, ... how often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldst not. Behold, your house shall be left to you desolate" (Mt. 23: 37). Israel, indeed, has merited her own rejection as the chosen people; yet the designs of Providence in her regard have not been frustrated. By teaching the old economy of salvation she has prepared the way for the new. By her Diaspora she has prepared the fertile field in which the Apostles will sow the seeds of the doctrine of Jesus, Savior of the world.

Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

TOLLE, LEGE

Rev. Matthew Schumacher, C.S.C., Ph.D., LL.D.

We are all familiar with the words, *Tolle, Lege,* as the account is given in *The Confessions of Saint Augustine* (8:5). Benedict XV in *Spiritus Paraclitus* tells us that Augustine and Jerome were first repelled by the Scriptures, but after adequate time given to *Lege,* they were so captured and engrossed by the word of God that they stand alone in the service rendered to its penetration and propagation. We are here concerned with the importance of *reading* the Bible; reading it until we can say we have really made it the controlling element in our lives, until we have fulfilled the desire expressed by Benedict XV: "Our one desire for all the Church's children is that, being saturated with the Bible, they may arrive at the all-surpassing knowledge of Jesus Christ."[1] Since the number who read the Bible is not too large, we can readily see how few they are who are really masters of this Book, who are really "saturated with the Bible."

Perhaps, there is no one thing that would mean more to the world today than the presence among us of a goodly number—from every rank in the Church—of masters of the Written Word, "saturated with the Bible"!

The *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* April, 1943, presented scholarly papers on the *Providentissimus Deus* of Leo XIII, commemorating the fiftieth anniversary of its appearance. They dealt with the Bible from the angle of the student. The first part of the encyclical is taken up with the Bible as it affects all followers of Christ, as a book all should read, know, and love, the teachings of which should find fruitful expression in Christlike living. I am not a Scripture specialist in the technical sense. But I have had occasion to read the Bible frequently, and have taught the Bible through *actual reading* in the classroom long enough to have the definite conviction that such reading, persistent reading, is not only our best tribute to this "Letter written by our heavenly Father and transmitted by the sacred writers to the human race in its pilgrimage so far from the country,"[2] but it is one of the greatest sources for character-building and proper

[1] *Rome and the Study of Scripture,* p. 78. Quotations from *Providentissimus Deus* and *Spiritus Paraclitus* are taken from *Rome and the Study of Scripture,* edited by Cyril Gaul, O.S.B.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 2.

motivation in our social relations. "How familiar the spectacle of people who seem to have a superficial knowledge of all that has been said about the Bible, while almost inconceivably ignorant of what the Bible itself says! Such a man will really never love his Bible for the simple reason that he does not know it."[3]

Generous quotations from this first part of Pope Leo's encyclical will, it seems to me, refresh our memories on what this Book should mean to us. The five paragraphs dealing with the *doctrinal* aspect of the Bible give us: St. Paul's pregnant unfolding of "all Scripture inspired by God"—a rather complete characterization of values in itself; Christ's frequent use of the Old Testament for important purposes—giving, as it were, undoubted encouragement for our continued study of the Old Testament; the Apostles' imitation of the Master in the use of the Law and the Prophets; the 'eagerness' all should manifest in utilizing the Bible; the light we receive on the necessary subjects of the "Savior of the world, the Church, her institutions, her office, morality, and discipline."

The words of the encyclical give body to this summary:

> Among the reasons for which the Holy Scripture is so worthy of commendation—in addition to its own excellence and to the homage which we owe to God's Word—the chief of all is, the innumerable benefits of which it is the source; according to the infallible testimony of the Holy Spirit Himself, who says: "All Scripture is inspired by God and useful for teaching, for reproving, for correcting, for instructing in justice; that the man of God may be perfect, equipped for every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16-17). That such was the purpose of God in giving the Scripture to men is shown by the example of Christ our Lord and of His Apostles.... Faithful to His precepts, the Apostles, although He Himself granted "signs and wonders to be done by their hands" (Acts 14:3), nevertheless used with the greatest effect the sacred writings, in order to persuade the nations everywhere of the wisdom of Christianity, to conquer the obstinacy of the Jews, and to suppress the outbreak of heresy.... Let all, therefore, understand how deeply the sacred books should be esteemed, and with what eagerness and reverence they should approach this great arsenal of heavenly arms. For those whose duty it is to handle Catholic doctrine before the learned or the unlearned will nowhere find more ample matter or more abundant exhortation, whether on the subject of God, the supreme Good and the all-perfect Being, or of the works which display His glory and His love. Nowhere is there anything more full

[3] Hugh Pope, O.P., "The Teaching of the Bible for the Ministry," *The Ecclesiastical Review*, 88 (1933), p. 26.

or more express on the subject of the Savior of the world than is to be found in the whole range of the Bible.... As St. Jerome says, "to be ignorant of the Scripture is not to know Christ." In its pages, His image stands out, living and breathing; diffusing everywhere around consolation in trouble, encouragement to virtue, and attraction to the love of God. And as to the Church, her institutions, her nature, her office, and her gifts, we find in Holy Scripture so many references and so many ready and convincing arguments, that as St. Jerome again most truly says: "A man who is well grounded in the testimonies of the Scripture is the bulwark of the Church." And if we come to morality and discipline, an apostolic man finds in the sacred writings abundant and excellent assitance; most holy precepts, gentle and strong exhortation, splendid examples of every virtue and finally the promise of eternal reward and the threat of eternal punishment, uttered in terms of solemn import, in God's name and in God's own words.[4]

Three of these statements might bear a little comment: (1) "Let all understand how deeply the sacred books should be esteemed and with what eagerness and reverence they should approach this great arsenal of heavenly arms." Perhaps a good way to measure the extent of our esteem and reverence is to note our readiness to utilize "this great arsenal of heavenly arms." So many things are more honored in the breach than in the observance. (2) "No where is there anything more full or more express on the subject of the Savior of the world than is to be found in the whole range of the Bible." We are here reminded that the Bible is the story of Christ; it is Christ by anticipation in the Old Testament, Christ in Person in the New Testament. He is the unifying element in the Bible, and creates interest in portions of it that otherwise might not be too attractive. The many references to the Old in the New and the reason for these references show how this Book, with all its variety, is the fascinating account of the Expected and the Realized of nations. Hence, the true sensing of Saint Jerome "to be ignorant of the Scripture is not to know Christ." (3) "A man who is well-grounded in the testimonies of the Scriptures is the bulwark of the Church." Today we hear much of bulwarks and arsenals and we realize their undoubted value. "They (the inspired writers) form the witness of her ministry, the *vade mecum* of the priests and the text book of her teaching."[5] Father Pope writes:

[4] *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, pp. 3-4.

[5] K. Vaughan, "The Popular Use of The Bible," *Catholic World*, 58 (1894), p. 558.

The use of destructive Biblical criticism has distorted our perspective. We have become frankly hagridden by the critics and have had to stand on the defensive everywhere. Sometimes one is almost tempted to lay the blame for this on the great Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*. Leo XIII did—in the epoch-making Encyclical—give immense encouragement to the critical study of the Bible by us Catholics and we can never be too grateful for the impulse he thus gave. But there is another section of the Encyclical of which we are inclined to lose sight, that namely, wherein the Pontiff insists on the Bible itself, and not on the critical study of it as being the priests' manual.[6]

We might here also include the laity in the non-critical reading of the Bible itself, and make it a *vade mecum* for them. The Bible for the Church becomes "the quarry of her teaching."

This great "arsenal of heavenly arms" has always been used to advantage by preachers and orators—carrying out Christ's original commission of teaching. This fact Pope Leo calls to our attention in some three paragraphs, noting what it means "for the saving and for the perfection of ourselves and of others," and that we must "bring to this divine reading not only docility and attention, but also piety and an innocent life."

The words of Pope Leo again give us a worthy amplification:

All those who have a right to speak are agreed that there is in the Holy Scripture an eloquence that is wonderfully varied and rich, and worthy of great themes. This St. Augustine thoroughly understood and has abundantly set forth. This, also, is confirmed by the best preachers of all ages, who have gratefully acknowledged that they owed their repute chiefly to the assiduous use of the Bible, and to devout meditation on its pages. The holy Fathers well knew all this by practical experience, and they never cease to extol the sacred Scripture and its fruits.... Let us listen to the words of St. Jerome, in his Epistle to Nepotian: "Often read the divine Scriptures; yea; let holy reading be always in thy hand; study that which thou thyself must preach—Let the speech of the priest be ever seasoned with scriptural reading."... It was not to Timothy alone, but to the whole order of the clergy, that the command was addressed: "Take heed to thyself and to thy teaching, be earnest in them. For in so doing thou wilt save both thyself and those who hear thee" (1 Tim. 4:6). For the saving and for the perfection of ourselves and of others, there is at hand the very best of help in the Holy Scriptures, as the Book of Psalms, among others, so constantly insists; but those only will find it who bring to this divine reading not only docility and attention but also piety and an innocent life. For the Sacred Scripture is not like other books. Dictated by the Holy Spirit, it contains things of the deepest importance, which, in many instances, are most difficult and obscure. To understand and explain such things, there is always re-

[6] Pope, *loc. cit.*, p. 23.

quired the 'coming' of the same Holy Spirit; that is to say, His light and His grace; and these, as the Royal Psalmist so frequently insists, are to be sought by humble prayer and guarded by holiness of life.[7]

One of the delights of Church history is to read about the far-reaching influence of the many outstanding preachers who spoke "not only in word, but in power also, and in the Holy Spirit, and in much fullness" (1 Thess. 1:5), who awakened, comforted, strengthened, and saved the faithful at times when the faith was weak—and isn't it weak often?—their words, "the sword of the Spirit."

Pope Leo passed from the doctrinal treatment of the Bible to the *attitude* of the Church regarding the Bible through the centuries. It is due to the wisdom and action of the Church that there has always been, from century to century, a cultivation of the Holy Scriptures that has been remarkable and that has born such worthy fruit. In this matter, as in everything that concerns individual and social welfare, the Church has avoided extremes, for she is the custodian of truth, not the disturber of men's minds, nor the underminer of national good. It can never be said of her, "you err, not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God" (Mt. 22:29). Pope Leo tells us:

> It is well to recall how, from the beginning of Christianity, all who have been renowned for holiness of life and sacredness of learning, have given their deep and constant attention to Holy Scriptures. If we consider the immediate disciples of the Apostles, Saint Clement of Rome, Saint Ignatius of Antioch, Saint Polycarp—or the Apologists, such as Saint Justin and Saint Irenaeus, we find that in their letters and books, whether in defence of the Catholic Faith or in its commendation, they drew faith, strength, and unction from the Word of God.[8]

We are grateful today that so much of the Scriptures is "in their letters and books." For them, it was immediate defence, power, and life; for us it is all that and valuable history in addition.

We are reminded that in the great "catechetical and theological schools there was little taught but what was contained in the readings, interpretations, and the defence of the written word."[9] As we move on, we find "in the twelfth century, many took up, with great success, the allegorical exposition of Scripture. In this, Saint Bernard is pre-eminent, and his writings, it may be

[7] *Rome and the Study of Scripture*, pp. 4-5. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 6. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

said, are Scripture all through."[10] Then, in the golden age of Scholasticism, "came fresh and welcome progress in the study of the Bible." "The valuable work of the scholastics in Holy Scripture is seen in their theological treatises and in their Scripture commentaries; and in this respect, the greatest name among them all is Saint Thomas Aquinas."[11] In this period, the Bible was always read carefully, and its main purpose, with the best students, was never forgotten in the scrutiny given its literal meaning. The work of Saint Thomas is our best guarantee of this wholesome fact. The interest of the Church in making the Bible easily available for reading is thus brought out: "In a brief space of time, innumerable editions, especially of the Vulgate, poured from the press and were diffused throughout the Catholic world; so honored and loved was Holy Scripture during that very period against which the enemies of the Church direct their calumnies."[12] The activity of the century which followed the Council of Trent is recalled, "when it almost seemed that the great age of the Fathers had returned."[13]

In the concluding sentences of the first part of the encyclical, Pope Leo puts in summary form the continuous concern of the Church that her children should have the Bible always at hand: "The calm and fair consideration of what has been said will clearly show that the Church has never failed in taking due measures to bring the Scriptures within reach of her children, and that she has ever held fast and exercised profitably that guardianship conferred upon her by Almighty God for the protection and glory of His Holy Word; so that she has never required, nor does she now require, any stimulation from without."[14]

By way of contrast, the efforts of the adversaries of the Bible "directed against the more ignorant masses of the people," is brought to our attention.

> They diffuse their deadly poison by means of books, pamphlets, and newspapers; they spread it by addresses and by conversation; they are found everywhere; and they are in possession of numerous schools, taken by violence from the Church, in which, by ridicule and scurrilous jesting, they pervert the credulous and unformed minds of the young to the contempt of Holy Scripture. Should not these things stir up and set on fire the heart of every pastor, so that to this 'so-called knowledge' (1 Tim. 6:20) may be opposed the ancient and true science which the Church, through the Apostles, has received from

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 7. [11] *Ibid.*, p. 7. [12] *Ibid.*, p. 7. [13] *Ibid.*, p. 8. [14] *Ibid.*, p. 8.

Christ, and that Holy Scripture may find the champions that are needed in so momentous a battle?[15]

The following statements of Pius VI, Pius VII, and the Third Council of Baltimore are in the letter and spirit of Leo XIII in reference to the Scriptures for the laity. In a brief sent by Pope Pius VI to Martini, Archbishop of Florence, we read:

At a time when a vast number of bad books are circulated, even among the unlearned, to the great destruction of souls, you judge exceedingly well that the faithful should be aroused to the reading of the Holy Scriptures, for these are the most abundant sources which ought to be left open to every one to draw from them purity of morals and of doctrine, and to eradicate the errors which are so widely spread in these corrupt times.[16]

Pius VII, writing to the English Bishops in the year 1820, exhorts them to "encourage the people to read the Holy Scripture, for nothing can be more useful, more consolatory, and more animated, because they serve to confirm the faith, to spread hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian." These pontifical briefs [others are mentioned in the article] fixed beyond a doubt, if words have any meaning, the actual discipline and spirit of the Catholic Church regarding the lay use of the Scripture.[17]

The same article quotes the Third Council of Baltimore: "It can hardly be necessary for us to remind you that the most highly valued treasure of every family library, and the most frequently and lovingly made use of should be the Holy Scripture."[18] What the faithful should and should not seek in the reading of the Scripture is given in this compact form: "for the faithful laity, also, they [the Scriptures] are a treasury where they seek not their creed, which is taught them by the infallible Church, nor the regeneration of their souls; but strength in faith, support in hope, and increase in charity."[19]

The concluding thought of the encyclical is the appeal to every one to "always approach the sacred writings with reverence and piety," to learn how to avoid error, to imbibe the spirit of Christ:

Finally, We admonish, with paternal love, all students and ministers of the Church, always to approach the sacred writings with reverence and piety; for it is impossible to attain to the profitable understanding thereof unless the arrogance of earthly science be laid aside, and there be excited in the heart the holy desire for that wisdom "which is from above." In this way the intelligence, which is once admitted to these sacred studies, and thereby illuminated and strengthened, will

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
[16] Vaughan, *loc. cit.*, pp. 592-593.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 593.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 594.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 589.

acquire a marvelous facility in detecting and avoiding the fallacies of human science, and in gathering and using for eternal salvation all that is valuable and precious; whilst, at the same time, the heart will grow warm, and will strive, with ardent longing, to advance in virtue and in divine love. "Blessed are they who examine His testimonies; they shall seek Him with their whole heart" (Ps. 18:2).[20]

The Reverend H. Heuser[21] comments on the Encyclical: "The careful reading of this letter (of Pope Leo) must convince us how important a part our study of the Bible has always played in the Church.... If men have grown remiss at any time, in the use of this heavenly gift (the Sacred Book) it can not be said that the Church failed to keep before them its admirable utility." The same author also reminds us,[22] "The Bible is on so many accounts, a source of intellectual pleasure, of abiding peace of heart, and of that high moral refinement which comes from contacts we may enjoy in the participation of the celestial inspiration which we breathe through their writings."

Biblical scholars will ever protect the great treasure of the Scripture from forces that would weaken or destroy its integrity or tend to deprive it, in any way, of its real distinction. For all of us, biblical scholars included, it should and will be "a Letter written by our Heavenly Father and transmitted by the sacred writers to the human race in its pilgrimage so far from its country."

How to read the Bible is a separate subject. There are four or five ways of reading the Bible, each giving the reader much in return for time expanded. The *one way,* of course, is to keep at it until, in the words of Benedict XV, we are "saturated with the Bible," for, after all, the One we learn to know and love in the Bible is the One we hope to live with forever.

St. Mary's College,
Notre Dame, Indiana

[20] *Rome and the Study of Scripture,* p. 23.
[21] *Chapters of Bible Study,* pp. 147, 148.
[22] *Ibid.,* p. 146.

ERGON IN THE GOSPELS

Rev. James A. Kleist, S.J., A.M., Ph.D.

There is a group of words in the New Testament which need careful attention, not to say loving care, if a wholly satisfactory modern English translation is to be attempted; and *ergon* (ἔργον) is one of them. An ordinary, unpretentious word, it is often found in contexts which savor of "business"; but, again, it may rise to the plane of sublimity. An instance of the former sense is Mk. 13:34: "the *work* (or: task) each one is to do"; for the latter, compare our Lord's reference to His divine *mission* in the world, in Jn. 4:34: "that I may complete His work" (sc. the great Work of the Redemption). The word occurs in varying proportions in every NT writer. Its total of occurrences is 175, the lion's share of which falls to St. Paul, who has made of it a term consecrated in Catholic theology. The only Epistle in which he manages to get along without it is that to Philemon. St. John uses it in his Gospel twenty-seven times, as against its nine occurrences in the Synoptics. We have, then, a fairly ample *materia circa quam* for testing its mettle.

Asked to state offhand what *ergon* means, anyone would naturally hit upon 'work.' 'Work' and *ergon* tally exactly both in etymology and in general usage. So far so good. But I would like to raise the question whether a modern translator *should* limit himself to 'work' for every *ergon* in the NT. Will 'work' do full justice to the specific context in which a particular *ergon* appears? Will it at once put the modern American reader in full possession of the flavor intended by the Greek writer? A scholar has the leisure and the training to linger over every *ergon* to his heart's content; and if he is a commentator, he can embody the results of his musings in a learned footnote. But what about the average reader (not to say, 'the tired businessman'!) who is unacquainted with Greek? What about your Sunday congregation which must either grasp the shade of meaning conveyed by 'work' then and there, or else give up understanding it? It seems to me to be the function (the *ergon*, if you please) of translation to spare the reader as much mental labor (another *ergon!*) as possible and, by a proper choice of words, help him to an intelligent understanding of the thought of the

Evangelist: the reader's Bible is not the Greek original, but his English translation.

There are those who hold that a translator should fasten upon one definite English term for each Greek expression and stick to that through thick and thin. I have no doubt but that something can be said in support of this attitude. Certain words of the NT have found their way into Catholic theology and represent certain clear-cut ideas that must not be tampered with. *Kalon ergon* is one of them, meaning a 'good work,' a meritorious action (*ergon* again!) needed besides bare faith to insure salvation. By all means, then, let us retain 'good work' and 'good works' to express just that sense. But to raise such retention to the dignity of a general principle is something I should be slow to endorse. Such self-imposed limitation cripples the hand of a modern translator. I admit that this is largely a matter of taste; and, of course, *de gustibus non est disputandum.* It might even be claimed that such a rigid adherence to that principle preserves the 'flavor' of NT Greek, whereas its opposite, that restless flitting about for some suitable variant for 'work' every time an *ergon* appears in the Greek, is apt to make the reader forget that he is reading a Greek (or Aramaic) document. But one thing is certain, this 'single-term' theory runs counter to our classical training. The Greek and Latin languages are conspicuous for a considerable poverty of vocabulary, as compared with the wealth of modern English. The result is that Greek and Latin writers are often compelled to be content with a generic term in contexts where the genius of modern English looks for a more specific term. The most obvious illustration of this discrepancy between English and the classical languages is the Latin *res,* that 'blank cheque,' for which the student is trained to find a suitable modern equivalent. Woe to the young Latinist who says 'thing' wherever the Latin writer has *res.* It may be 'matter' that is wanted, or 'affair' or 'event' or 'circumstance 'or 'cause' or 'achievement' or 'fortune' or 'money' or almost anything else. Why not apply this principle to our rendering of the Greek NT? No one in his senses would maintain that the use of 'thing' for every *res* preserves the 'flavor' of the Latin! It is not so much in individual words that the 'flavor' of a writer resides as in his general habit of thought and in his way of stringing words together to form sentences.

But 'flavor' or no 'flavor,' a translator's first duty is to write with unmistakable clearness; and that seems to require constant

variation of expression. It would be a grievous error to suppose that to a Greek writer a *kai* meant invariably the same that an 'and' means to us. Every school grammar calls attention to the chameleonic many-sidedness of this 'pliable and hood-humored *καί*.'[1] And so in all other cases. The function (*ergon*!) of a translation is to call up in *my* mind that *particular* idea or shade of meaning which a generic term conveyed to a Greek or Latin writer. The Greeks, though limited by a narrow vocabulary, were yet quick-witted and had a fine sense of logical distinction.

One of these blank cheques is *ergon*.[2] A fine illustration of it is in Mt. 5:16, its first occurrence in the NT: "In the same way, your light must shine before your fellow men so that they may see *your good example* and give glory to your Father who is in Heaven." There is nothing in 'good example' which is not also expressed in *kala erga,* and vice-versa. In either case we have outward actions, deeds visible to others, capable of making a good impression on them and edifying them. *Ergon,* in other words, is, generally, an outward action or deed freighted with some inward meaning or special effect according to the context. The phrase 'good works' in Mt. 5:16 seems less apt, for it too readily suggests the theological sense of 'virtuous and meritorious deed,' a sense not here excluded, but not prominent. Similarly, Mt. 23:3: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in the Chair of Moses. Obey, therefore, whatever rules or precepts they may lay down for you: only do not imitate *their example,*" or: "do not imitate them in *their private conduct.*" Here the official utterances of the scribes are contrasted with their conduct as private individuals. The addition of 'private' in the rendering is, therefore, justified by the context. V:5: "Their whole *conduct* (or *behavior*) has but one aim—to attract public attention." Lk. 11:48: "You sympathize with the *conduct* (or: the *doings*) of your fathers, for they did the killing, and you do the building of the tombs."

This, then, is the upshot: *ergon* is a general term for some sort of *activity* (or its result)[3] which receives its specific color

[1] See, for instance, my *The Gospel of St. Mark* (Milwaukee: Bruce), p. 152.

[2] The same is true of the Latin *opus* and *opera.*

[3] A strictly scientific treatise on the force of *ergon* in Greek literature would have to take into account its use in all the Greek writers from Homer down. See, for instance, H. Bonitz's *Index Aristotelicus.* For the imme-

from the context: 'act, action, deed, labor, work, product, operation, exercise, doing, execution, transaction,' etc. The plural *erga* means a series or aggregate of actions that sum up a person's 'conduct, occupation, task, stint, business, job, employment, function, doings, duty, service, calling, office, ministry, undertaking, enterprise, practice, dealings,' etc. This sense is, however, also found in the singular: for a series of acts may be viewed as one great act. Cardinal Newman somewhere contrasts "the fatal *deed* of the first Adam" with "the great *achievement* of the second Adam." Here *ergon* would do both for *deed* and for *achievement*. though it would leave the force of the synonyms unexpressed. The idea of a *mission* (so common in the Gospels) is finally illustrated in Mt. 11:19: John came (with a mission; a common meaning of ἦλθε) ... The Son of Man came (with a mission)... "Just the same, Wisdom is justified by the *mission* she has assigned to each (τὰ ἔργα αὐτῆς)"[4] or "by assigning each a different *mission*" or, "a different *task* or *way of life*." The German language abounds in abstract nouns that express this idea: 'das Handeln, das Wirken, das Walten, das Verhalten'.[5]

The plural *erga* is very common in St. John. It sometimes alternates with the singular, as in 6:28,29. I must repeat that I am not quarrelling with translators who prefer 'work' and 'works' everywhere. I merely suggest that there are more appropriate words at hand, and words, too, that seem less grating on our ears. All will admit, I think, that 'work' and, especially, 'works' are not in themselves beautiful words. Usage, it is true, has sanctioned and ennobled them in many connections. We speak of the *work* of St. Peter Claver among the Negroes; of the missionary *work* (or: activity) of the Church; and, particularly, of Christ's *work* on earth. Again, we speak of *works* of mercy and charity; of the *works* of a writer, the *works* of art and genius. In the Morning Offering we offer our 'prayers, *works*, and sufferings,' where '*actions*, prayers, and sufferings' would be a good substitute. But over against this dignified usage there are instances where *works* drops to a decidedly lower level; compare fire-*works*, earth-*works*, out-*works*, the municipal water-

diate purposes of this paper, it is enough to consult our standard NT Lexica, as Zorell, Bauer, Thayer.

[4] I am using Father Merk's *Novum Testamentum Graece*.

[5] Lagrange: "l'economie du salut qu'elle a ordonnée"; Zahn: 'das sittliche Gesamtverhalten und die berufsmässige Arbeit.'

works, the interior *works* of a clock, the *works* of the devil, the Board of *Works* and Public Buildings. Colloquial speech takes still further liberties. Consequently, wherever *erga* is to be rendered, one should think twice before using 'works' to express the thought. After all, a translation is made for the ordinary reader, not for the biblical scholar. He is, therefore, to be reckoned with. Again, I repeat, I am not belittling the work of others who cling to 'work' or 'works' persistently; but I do think that a translator, before fixing on a certain rendering, might do well to picture himself as reading it to an ordinary Sunday congregation and watching *their* reactions.

Nothing is easier than to lay down general principles and tell others what they ought to do. It is much more difficult to apply them to concrete cases. *Hic Rhodus hic salta.* But the effort is, I think, worth while, even if the result should not prove altogether satisfactory. With due respect, therefore, to the reader's *melius iudicium* I will propose the subjoined renderings.

Mk. 13:34: "It is as when a man is about to go abroad. Before leaving his house, he gives his slaves their proper authority, assigning to each his special task." Here *work* for *task* would be good, too. If there is a banal touch in *work,* that would make it quite suitable here. But *task* seems a pleasant variant.

Jn. 4:34: "To do the will of Him whose Ambassador I am and to complete His *work*—that is my food." 'His work'='the work He has assigned.' 'The work of Redemption' is, I think, a very respectable expression, and consecrated by general usage.

Jn. 17:4: "I have glorified Thee on earth by completing the *work* Thou hast assigned to me." A reference to the Divine Work of the Redemption. "By accomplishing the *mission* Thou hast entrusted to me" would be a pleasing variant.

Jn. 3:19: "The Light came into the world, and men have loved the darkness more than the Light, for their *lives were bad.*" V:20: "Only one" (a common meaning of *pas*) "who is given to *mean practices*" (or: if *phaula* was meant to contrast with *aletheia* in v. 21: one who is *dishonest in his dealings*) "hates the light and refuses to come out into the light, for fear his *practices* (*conduct*) might be exposed." V. 21: "On the other hand, one who *is* perfectly *honest*" (or: *acts with perfect sincerity*) "comes out into the light, so that it becomes evident that his *life is lived* in union with God" (the play on words is also in the Greek). For the connotations here ascribed to *phaula* and

aletheia, see Père Lagrange and Zahn. Perhaps it may be best to be content with some generic terms, for which see *The New Testament in Basic English.*[6]

The difficulties presented by Jn. 6:27 ff. are much more serious. 27: *"Exert yourselves* (ἐργάζεσθε) to procure, not the food bound to perish, but the food that lasts for eternal life." The current "do not labor for the food" is correct; but note, please, that the play on words (ἐργάζεσθε, ἔργον) is lost in both renderings. The translator felt, no doubt, as we all do, that 'to work for food' is too banal for the context. V. 28: "How must we go about it to *do* what God *wants us to do?*" Here, one is delighted to see, the revisers changed the Douay rendering: "What must we do that we may *work the works* of God?" This hurts modern feeling. Their own translation is: "that we may *perform the works* of God." The plural *erga* seems to emphasize the various items that make up all that God wants us to do. Our Lord, in His answer, uses the singular *ergon* and stresses the *unum necessarium:* This is *what* God *wants you to do:* to believe in His Ambassador." Allied to this is 5:20: "In fact, the Father will show Him (or: let Him see) even greater *things to* do."[7] John 7:3: "Quit this part of the country and go to Judea: let your disciples see *what you are doing."* The reference is not exclusively to miracles. Here a word might be said about the 'flavor' of *ta erga sou:* Our Lord's brethren were worldly people who admire a *successful* businessman. To them, 'success' is the climax of earthly greatness. Hence: "Nobody, of course, acts in secret who wants publicity for himself. As you are having such success, let your light shine before the big world." Our Lord was making 'a great stir' throughout the land.

Jn. 7:7: "The world cannot afford to hate you: but it does hate me, because I show up *all its wickedness."*

[6] For substitutes of 'works' in such general contexts, compare, for instance, Card. Newman's: "The sight of those who have not sinned . . . often disturbed the plunderer or assassin in the midst of his *guilty doings";* or Coleridge's: "My thoughts, wishes, and prayers follow you in all your *doings* and strivings." Modern scholarship is wont to sum up Christ's life by the phrase: "the sayings and doings of Jesus." See Acts 1:1.

[7] In many contexts 'a thing to do' will fitly express the sense of *ergon,* as in Xenophon *Mem.* 1,3,10: *rhipsokindynon ergon* (ῥιψοκίνδυνον ἔργον) 'that was a reckless thing to do,' 'a reckless business,' 'an adventure' (Marchant).

Jn. 10:32: "Many a kindly (or: commendable) *deed* I performed under your very eyes: for which particular *deed* do you intend to stone me?"

Jn. 8:39: "If you are children of Abraham, then you will do *as* Abraham *did"*; or: "you will imitate his *example."* V. 41: "You are doing just what your father (the devil) *does"*; or: "you are *following in the footsteps* of your father." This is 'plain English' for those infidels.

Jn. 14:10: "The words which I speak to you (the message which I preach, the assertions I make) do not originate with me (are not my own invention); and as for the deeds—why, the Father is personally responsible for them" (*autos*). V. 11: "Take my word for it: I am in the Father and the Father is in me; but if you will not do that, at least (*auta*) let the *deeds* induce you to believe." *auta:* let the *facts* speak *for themselves* and convince you. 'Works' as a reference to our Lord's miracles is, of course, intelligible. We may, therefore, contrast 'word' and 'work,' or 'word' and 'deed.' Both expressions are idiomatic.

Jn. 9:3: We are familiar with *to ergon* and *ta erga tou Theou* as denoting the things God wants *us* to do. See 6:28. In Jn. 9:3 we go deeper: we glimpse the *inner workings* of Divine Providence; God's *arrangements* for men's salvation; His *dealings* with mankind; the *Economy* of Redemption; God's habitual manner of acting (note the plural), His *behavior* toward us—in manifesting to the world the Divine Sonship of Jesus. Père Lagrange calls it *le plan divin* and *le dessein de Dieu,* which is to be 'worked out' among men; His *'hidden purposes'* which must be brought to light. Note also that in *en auto* the force of the preposition is instrumental: in God's plan, therefore, the blind man is to be instrumental in revealing the hidden purposes of God. This is more intelligible than 'the works of God.' German is here superior to English when it speaks of 'das Walten und Wirken' Gottes (Zahn).

Cardinal Newman somewhere says: "What was the grand theme of conversation between Mary and her Son but the nature, the attributes, the providence, and *the works* of Almighty God? Would He not unfold to her the solemn eternal decrees, the *purposes* and *will* of God?" In both sentences the Greek *erga* would be appropriate.

There is a word in English which seems to me to cover the Greek perfectly: "Neither this man has sinned nor his parents. No; God simply wants to make use of him to reveal His *Ways*."

The renderings just proposed are attempts to express in plain English the thought of the Evangelist. They have, I think, this advantage that *they meet the average modern reader on his own ground.* The words used are part and parcel of our best everyday speech. There is a flavor in them that is absent from the rather abstract, humdrum, workaday, overworked 'works.' The common reader and the scholar are two different groups of men. The latter needs the original for his tool: the former wants a ready way of getting at the thought of the Evangelist, a sort of short cut. In our dogma classes we argue from the Greek, not from a translation. The general reader's Bible is his favorite translation.

I have omitted from my survey one text (Mt. 26:10) with its parallels, where the plain *ergon* leaps into the fullness of its power—an outward deed or act impregnated with an inward, spiritual meaning, a meaning, by the way, read into it by none less than our Lord Himself. But of this some other time.[8]

I should be glad if some reader of the Biblical Quarterly would search into St. Paul's use of *ergon* and throw more light on this interesting problem.

I notice that Father Spencer keeps 'work' or 'works' in nineteen out of the thirty-seven passages in the Gospels.

St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

[8] "She has given *beautiful expression* to her devotion to me."

THE GOSPEL OF THE EPIPHANY

Rev. Edward J. Houdous, S.J., S.S.D.

Although the Epiphany is one of the highest ranking feasts in the ecclesiastical calendar, the details surrounding its gospel message (Mt. 2:1-12) have puzzled scholars through the centuries. The substance of the mystery is evident enough; and it is the substance which the Church solemnly celebrates. In the Epiphany, Providence through Christ began to bring the whole world back to an economy of salvation as closely resembling the primitive economy as the world will ever see. Before the fall of man the plan of God was that all men were to be given a direct share in divinely revealed truth; but Adam rejected that plan and his children through uncounted generations never completely profited by it. After centuries of sin a new merciful scheme was established according to which divinely revealed truth was concentrated on the Jews who were to radiate it out to the whole world. But the Jews too were not remarkably loyal to their trust. Finally, the new, universal economy was unfolded. From the chosen Jews came the Christ, "the True Light that enlightens every man who comes into the world" (Jn. 1:9). To the Jews and to Gentiles, to every man of good will, would the Word of God shine forth in this last age of the world, much as it did in the first age, and so the mystery was made known "that the Gentiles are joint heirs, and fellow-members of the same body, and joint partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus" (Eph. 3:6). The first revelation of this mystery was the Epiphany; and this first revelation of the mystery forms the substance of the Church's festivity. The substance is simple enough; the accidentals attendant upon the revelation of the mystery are not simple, and merit a commentary.

1. "Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea, in the days of King Herod, behold, there came Magi from the East to Jerusalem."

When Jesus was born. A better rendering would be, "Now after Jesus had been born in Bethlehem of Judea" because the aorist participle γεννηθέντος is used. How long a time had elapsed after the birth of Christ can be reasonably deduced from the gospel. Herod had asked of the Magi "the time when the star had appeared" (Mt. 2:7); and shortly after the Magi had re-

turned toward their home "all the boys in Bethlehem and its neighborhood who were two years old and under" were slaughtered "according to the time that he (Herod) had carefully ascertained from the Magi" (Mt. 2:16). Therefore a period of less than two years had likely elapsed between the birth of Christ and the visit of the Magi.

To place the time of this mystery in the scheme of events narrated in Mt. 2:1-23 and Lk. 2:1-40 is difficult; but the most acceptable sequence is probably the following:

a) Jesus born at Bethlehem (Lk. 2:1-7);
b) Shepherds adore (Lk. 2:8-20);[1]
c) Circumcision at Bethlehem on the eighth day after the Child's birth according to Lev. 12:3 (Lk. 2:21);
d) Purification and Presentation at Jerusalem forty days after the Boy's birth according to Lev. 12:2-4 (Lk. 2:22-38);
e) Return to Bethlehem, to a *house* (Mt. 2:11), not to the stable.
f) The Adoration of the Magi (Mt. 2:1-12).

The return to Bethleheme is hard to prove because of Lk. 2:39: "And when they had fulfilled all things as prescribed in the Law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own town of Nazareth," which text seems to deny a return to Bethlehem. Yet that return is necessary, for the visit of the Magi took place at Bethlehem, apparently almost two years after Christ's birth. But, does Luke 2:39 deny a return to Bethlehem or merely omit it? Luke entirely omits the visit of the Magi and the Flight into Egypt; hence he would logically omit mentioning the return to Bethlehem. Moreover, he does not necessarily say that immediately after the Presentation the Holy Family returned to Nazareth. The ὡς with the indicative, which is translated by "when" (Lk. 2:39) and leaves the impression of "right after," can be causal and can entirely avoid the time element. If ὡς is "because" the verse reads, "And because they had fulfilled all things as prescribed in the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee" without stating when the return to Galilee took place.

However, there is another way out of the difficulty. Mt. 2:22, "But hearing that Archelaus was reigning in Judea in place of his father Herod, he (St. Joseph) was afraid to go there" seems to imply that after the sojourn in Egypt, Joseph's first plan had

[1] A. J. Maas, S.J., *The Life of Christ* (St. Louis: Herder, 1940), p. 31.

been to live in Judea, probably in the house at Bethlehem which the Holy Family occupied before the flight to Egypt. The possibilities then are that after the Purification and Presentation, the Holy Family went to Nazareth (Lk. 2:39) to bid farewell to friends, to prepare for moving to Bethlehem; that they actually made their home at Bethlehem, received the Magi in their house (Mt. 2:22), fled to Egypt (Mt. 2:13-18), intended to return to their house at Bethlehem (Mt. 2:22) but for fear of Archelaus took up their residence at Nazareth (Mt. 2:19-23), because Providence wanted Christ to be called a Nazarene. St. Luke, realizing that the Magi incident and the Flight to and Return from Egypt had been sufficiently treated in Matthew's account, would then be telling us that the Holy Family went to Nazareth after the Presentation (Lk. 2:39), would skip Bethlehem and Egypt and the second return to Nazareth, and would resume his narrative from the time that the Holy Family made Nazareth their permanent abode (Lk. 2:40). Simply put, Mt. 2:1–2:33 should be inserted between Lk. 2:39 and Lk. 2:40.

In the days of King Herod. Herod the Great began his reign 40 or 37 B.C., and died in the early part of April, 750 A.U.C. or 4 B.C.[2] The adoration of the Magi probably took place in 6 B.C.[3]

Behold there came Magi from the East to Jerusalem. The Magi appear about the dawn of Median history (*c.* 836 B.C.) as the priestly caste of the original Median tribes.[4] About 715 B.C. the Medes became a part of the Assyrian Empire under Sargon II and remained so until Assurbanipal's time. In 625 B.C. they gained their independence and constituted the Median Empire, which embraced the greater part of Iran, Assyria, Northern Mesopotamia, Armenia and Cappadocia, while to the Chaldean Empire of Babylon went Syria and Palestine.[5]

Since the priestly Magi had been included under the Assyrian Empire, they probably became members of the various nations into which that empire disintegrated. Hence, while Median in origin, they probably did in time, due to the vicissitudes of history, become associated with the Babylonians and therefore

[2] Francis X. Murphy, "The Date of Christ's Birth," *Catholic Historical Review*, XXIX (1943), p. 311; Urban Holmeister, *Chronologia Vitae Christi* (Rome: 1933), p. 22.

[3] Murphy, *loc. cit.*, 312-3.

[4] Herodotus, I, 101, 132, 140. VII, 43, 113.

[5] For historical outline, see *Encyclopedia Britannica, s.v.* "Media."

could understandably be mentioned in the same breath with the Chaldeans, as they are in the book of Daniel (e.g., 2:2).

But history was providential for them. In 550 B.C. Cyrus the Persian conquered the Medes, and the Magi shortly became a potent factor in Persian history. As priests and astrologers and generally as men of learning they were attached to the kings' household, and in fact because its overseers, though they never (except in the unfortunate revolutionary attempt of Smerdis in 522 B.C.) became occupants of the throne.[6] The kings consulted them as wise men, astrologers, interpreters of dreams. Their influence was exercised during the entire Persian period until the conquest by Alexander the Great in 330 B.C. Historically, then, they can be considered Median, Assyrian, Chaldean and Persian, but not Egyptian or part of a people of western lands like Greece, Italy or Spain.

From a religious viewpoint two potent factors in Magian history must now be considered. The first factor is that from the days of Darius II, 424 B.C.—and possibly as early as Darius I, 521 B.C.—the Magian religion was Zoroastrian. Beside the tenets about Ahura-Mazda which closely resembled belief in the true God, it included many other doctrines which made it "the highest religious result to which human reason unaided by revelation can attain."[7] Important for our purpose, we find among these doctrines, the theory about fravashis and the stars. The Zoroastrians maintained that all important personages had a kind of spiritual double, called a fravashi. Whether the fravashis were ancestor-spirits, guardian-spirits, a kind of manes, genii when taken as a group, is difficult to determine. Each individual human being—at least each important personage—was made up of vitality, ego, sense-perception, soul, and fravashi. The fravashi was the immortal part of a man and dwelt with Ahura-Mazda during a person's life-time, but at his death, the fravashi united itself to man's soul and thereby made it immortal. A person's fravashi existed before the man was born, and had some influence on the movements of the stars.[8] Hence, since the Magi were astrologers and Zoroastrians, they would conclude from some notable celestial phenomenon which they observed, that the

[6] Herodotus, III, 63; I, 107, 108, 120, 128; VII, 19, 37.

[7] P. Ernest Hull, S.J., *Catholc Encyclopedia, s.v.*, "Avesta, Theological Aspect of."

[8] Hastings, *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, s.v.*, "Fravashi."

fravashi of some notable personage was instrumental in effecting the phenomenon as an announcement of that personage's coming into the world. The learning of the Magi, which was at once religious and scientific, was kept in books; and the "Bible" of the Zoroastrians was the Avesta.

The second factor is that at just about this period in their history (*c.* 600 to 550 B.C.) the Jewish prophet Daniel, living in exile in their midst, was, after interpreting Nabuchodonosor's dream, made by that prince "a governor over all the provinces of Babylon, and chief of the magistrates over all the wise men of Babylon" (Dan. 2:48). It is impressive to note how carefully the Old Testament distinguishes the Magi of this district from astrologers of other territories like Egypt. The Hebrew word אַשָּׁפִים and the Aramaic אַשְׁפִין and אַשְׁפַיָּא are used exclusively for them; and the LXX and Theodotion's text restrict Μάγοι to them alone.[9] Now Daniel, the head of the wise men, specifically prophesies the time when the Messias is to be born (Dan. 9:25-27). Such a prophecy from such a leader must certainly have been conserved in the archives of the Magi priests and scientists for it could serve as a source-book to them of both religion and science.

But alas! their archives were destroyed in the course of succeeding history. It is a known fact that under Alexander the Great (*c.* 330 B.C.) the Avesta and books of learning of the Zoroastrians perished; and that for centuries their content was conserved chiefly by tradition. From tradition, then, did the Magi of succeeding generations probably anticipate the coming of the Messias at the time specified by Daniel. Little wonder, then, that after Rome under Pompey had conquered their territory, and while Augustus was governing them, knowing that the time specified by Daniel's prophecy was at hand, aware too, perhaps, that the Sibylline oracles and the restless world anticipated the arrival of a great personage from Palestine[10]—little wonder that, combining these predictions with their tenet about the fravashi and the stars, they should look for a sign in the

[9] Both the LXX and Theodotion translate Μάγοι in Dan. 2:2; 2:10. Theodotion, moreover, correctly so translates in Dan. 2:27; 4:7; 5:7; 5:11; 5:15.

[10] Virgil, *Eclogue*, IV, 4-59; Tacitus, *Hist.*, V, 13; Suetonius, *Vespasian*, IV; Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, VI, 5, 4.

heavens to herald for them the birth of the Christ in Judea. To Jerusalem, then, Judea's capital, would they go.

It is quite true that by the time of Christ the word "magi" had a more extensive use and was applied on occasion to sorcerers and magicians in other regions (Acts 8:9-24; 13:6,8); but the derived, applied, and extended meaning of a word does not argue away the original meaning, and "magi" applied to Jewish charlatans does not deny the existence of sincere priests and scientists in the East any more than "sheik" applied to an American gigolo denies the existence of true Arabian chieftains. By the fact that St. Matthew adds "from the East" to Magi, he may be intending to distinguish the true Magi from the substitutes who usurped the name.

The number of the Magi who came to Christ will probably never be known on earth. Interpreters of the Latin Church usually favor three, deriving that number possibly from the three gifts mentioned; the Eastern Church prefers twelve; and early Christians art usually depicts but two. Their names are even less authenticated than their number.[11]

2. "Saying, Where is the newly born king of the Jews? For we have seen his star in the East and have come to worship him."

King of the Jews. Daniel's prophecy speaks of the Messias as a Prince, and from other prophecies (e.g., Isa. 9:6) as well as from the profane predictions mentioned above it could easily be deduced that this Leader was a King. Hence the Magi sought this young Prince with the purpose of paying Him at least the homage due to a royal incumbent.

We have seen his star. In the light of their theory about fravashis, given above, it is easy to understand how the Magi would consider that the Christ's fravashi would affect the stars and hence why they should speak of the celestial phenomenon they had observed as His star. "In the East" will be discussed below.

3. "But when King Herod heard this, he was troubled, and so was all Jerusalem with him."

He had reason to be troubled, lest he and his family lose the kingship which was not in reality theirs. His kingship was in jeopardy from two sources. First, as the son of the Idumean, Antipater, Herod was not of the line of David as the King of the

[11] Walter Drum, S.J., *Catholic Encyclopedia, s.v.*, "Magi."

Jews was supposed to be and as the Messias actually was (Isa. 9:7). Secondly, his reign had been punctuated with all sorts of disturbances and threats to his royal power.[12]

That Jerusalem was stirred up with Herod indicates that the caravan of the Magi in its quest for a new Jewish King caused notable astonishment in the city. St. Matthew does not tell us what were the sentiments of the citizenry. Probably there were divided feelings—Herod's partisans being displeased, while his antagonists were glad to foresee the possibility of liberation from his yoke.

4. "And gathering together all the chief priests and Scribes of the people, he inquired of them where the Christ was to be born."

The chief priests cannot mean the men actually functioning as high priests at the time for there was only one actual high priest at any given period, as is evident from Scripture and Josephus. Beginning with Aaron (Exod. 29:5-7), a distinction between the one functioning as high priest and the other priests can be traced quite generally throughout the Old Testament.[13] The high-priesthood had before the time of Christ fallen on evil days, for to bribe oneself into the office had become a political racket. Herod "took the liberty to change the incumbents of the office at his pleasure—a liberty which the Romans exercised without restraint, so that at least the office was often little more than annual."[14] Hence the expression "being high priest that year" (Jn. 11:51). It is evident, then, that the chief priests in our text were men who either had previously exercised that office or at least were powerful members of the Sanhedrin.[15]

The Scribes of the people were the chief lawyers of the nation. Since the whole structure of the Jewish commonwealth was both religious as well as political and supposedly based on the Law of Moses, the lawyer or interpreter of Hebraic legislation was a politico-religious functionary, associated both with the Temple and the court. Herod was, indeed, in a peculiar position, attempting as he was to govern according to pagan Rome's be-

[12] Josephus, *Antiq.*, XIV, 15, 12-14; 15, 10, 4; XVI, 3; XVI, 9, 3 and 4.
[13] Num. 20:28; Jdgs. 20:28; 2 Par. 32:10; Also Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* IV, 3, 6-8; XX, 10.
[14] John Kitto, *Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature* (1857) *s.v.*, "Priest."
[15] Mt. 26:59; Jn. 18:13,24; Acts 4:6. Cf. Maas, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

hests as a subject king and at the same time trying to reconcile his government with the divine law of his people. Since the matter in question here concerned what prophecy had to say about the new king and, according to his suspicions, might affect the political situation as well, Herod logically consulted the influential men both in the priesthood and in the religio-political Sanhedrin of the Jewish nation.

5. "And they said to him, 'In Bethlehem of Judea; for thus it is written through the prophet.' " They gave a correct interpretation of the prophecy as we shall presently show.

6. " 'And thou, Bethlehem, of the land of Juda,
art by no means least among the princes of Juda;
For from thee shall come forth a leader
who shall rule my people Israel.' "

The Hebrew, LXX, and Matthew's text of Mich. 5:2 differ in form but have substantially the same meaning. The Hebrew has, "and thou Bethlehem Ephratah, insignificant as regards being amongst the thousands of Judah, from thee will a ruler in Israel come forth to me and his processions from amidst days of eternity." The LXX has, "And thou, Bethlehem house Ephrata, art least of being among thousands of Juda; from whom one will come forth to be a ruler of Israel and his goings forth from the beginning of days of eternity." Matthew in the Greek has, "And thou, Bethlehem land of Juda, in no wise art thou least among the leaders of Juda; for out of thee will come a leader, who will shepherd my people Israel."

In Matthew, Ephrata becomes Juda. Ephrata added to Bethlehem distinguishes the town from the Bethlehem a few miles northwest of Nazareth named in Jos. 19:15[16] and is Bethlehem of Juda.[17] In Matthew Bethlehem is said "in no wise" to be the least among the leading towns of Juda because it will produce the great leader, whereas the Hebrew and LXX assert that although it is insignificant or least among the thousands of inhabitants of Juda, nevertheless it will produce the great leader (and therefore the Heb. and LXX imply that it is not the least really). Clearly Matthew's citation is interpretative, which interpretation may be the Evangelist's own or one given by the

[16] Probably also in Jdgs. 12:8,10.
[17] Ruth 4:11; cf. Ruth 1:1; 1 Par. 4:4; 1 Kgs. 17:12.

chief priests and lawyers on the occasion or some rendering prevalent at the time.

7. "Then Herod summoned the Magi secretly, and carefully ascertained from them the time when the star had appeared to them."

His questioning of them was in private audience because he did not wish that in the minds of persons who knew his treachery and cruelty a suspicion of evil plans might be aroused and a warning given to the parents of the Child. It was also exact, so that a mistake in the Child's age might not frustrate any insidious scheme he might devise. He would have his victim without any misgivings. In fact there was to be a check-up on his data as the next verse indicates.

8. "And sending them to Bethlehem, he said, 'Go and make careful inquiry concerning the child, and when (implying "if" ἐπάν) you have found him, bring me word, that I too may go and worship him.' "

After receiving details as to the Child's residence, parentage etc. he too, he feigned, would pay the boy the homage of His station.

9. "Now they, having heard the king, went their way. And behold, the star they had seen in the East went before them, until it came and stood over the place where the child was."

Many Catholic and Protestant commentators (but not all, for this is an open question) would have the star to be an entirely miraculous phenomenon[18] created perhaps just for this occasion to bear the message to the Magi. There are various amplifications based on this assumption, the gist of which is the following: A miraculous star appears in the East, possibly moves on before the Magi guiding them to Jerusalem, then disappears. They consult Herod and upon leaving him, behold, the star which perhaps accompanied them to Jerusalem reappears and moves on before them to Bethlehem where it stops, low enough in the heavens to point out to them the spot in the town where the Child was to be found. The assumption that it was a miraculous star is based upon the further assumption that the Greek text, like the Vulgate, is hardly explainable unless we consider the star miraculous.

[18] Murphy, *l.c.*, p. 323.

But there are several difficulties allied with this assumption which, as weak points in the structure, merit notice. The first doubt arises from the fact that defenders of the miraculous star do not explain in what the miracle which they assume really consisted. Was a new star created for this occasion and then annihilated? If so, God worked a more stupendous cosmic miracle to convert a few Magi than Christ ever did to establish His Kingdom. Moreover, God did this, when by a Providential direction of their learning, He could have effected their conversion without a cosmic miracle. But perhaps the star was natural and like some otherwise unheard of comet was only disturbed in its course for the occasion. If so, the stupendousness of the miracle in comparison with Christ's miracles still remains, and again apparently with no apologetic necessity.

The doubt increases when we consider how incompletely St. Matthew recounts its miraculousness. He who throughout his gospel[19] clearly portrays historic details which bring out the miraculousness of Christ's deeds, in this tremendous miracle omits all such clear details. He fails to tell what might have brought out the miracle: whether the star shone continuously for nearly two years, whether it led the Magi to Jerusalem and then disappeared, whether it actually moved forward from Jerusalem and stopped at Bethlehem low enough to indicate the very spot where the Child was. In a word, he fails to record any detail which would clearly portray the event as miraculous, and the consequence of Matthew's silence in this matter is that defenders of the miraculous star cannot glean enough details to be able to agree among themselves on just what the constituents of the miracle were, or what its attendant circumstances. Strange too that the evangelist, who ordinarily takes advantage of quoting prophecies to confirm divine influence when it was exercised (Mt. 2:23)—strange that he should have overlooked Balaam's prophecy which, if used in an accommodated sense, could well illustrate this very great miracle (Num. 24:17).

But there is still another difficulty. A miraculous star leading the way directly to the child would have afforded Herod the easy opportunity of sending his trusties to Bethlehem, discover the Child, and when occasion was propitious, eliminate Him. Yet he passed up the miracle to trust to the report of foreigners if and

[19] Mt. 8; 9; 14; 15.

when (ἐπάν) they should find the Child. The text implies that Herod was by no means certain that the Messias would be found. But if the star miraculously guided the wayfarers he would have been certain that God was indicating the way infallibly and that the quest was not merely oriental astrology and science, experimenting on Jewish prophecy.

Then, too, some citizens of Jerusalem and most Bethlehemites would have been curious enough to investigate exact details about the Child and to visit Him whom such an astonishing portent pointed out; and such exact details would have reached Herod's inquiring ears and the inconvenience of murdering the town's infants would have been obviated. If we postulate the cosmic miracle, we must further postulate the moral miracle of Herod's inertia and the people's lack of curiosity, in order to keep the story as simple as Matthew presents it.

On the other hand, if we do not postulate the miracle, we know that God does use natural phenomena and does attach a supernatural significance to them in order to manifest His designs to those who are of good will. He did not create the rainbow after the flood as a proof that "all flesh shall be no more destroyed with the waters of a flood" (Gen. 9:11), but He appointed the natural phenomenon of the dispersion of light by particles of water as a "sign of the covenant" (Gen. 9:12) for people of good will that a generally destructive deluge would never again ensue. Again God did not necessarily inaugurate the practice of circumcising, but, for Abraham and his children, He did attach a supernatural meaning to this natural operation, thereby making circumcision "a sign of the covenant" (Gen. 17:11) between Yahweh and his people, the covenant namely "to be God to thee and to thy seed after thee" (Gen. 17:7). Therefore, God could have employed some natural phenomenon to be a sign to the Magian astronomers of good will that the Messias for whom they by sincere study of prophecy and of the stars were waiting, had actually been born.

Did He use such a natural phenomenon? It is likely that He did, because the theory of the miraculous star leaves much to be explained whereas a natural phenomenon theory avoids those difficulties, fits Matthew's text, and even elucidates certain phrasings in that text which the miracle theory confuses.

What the natural phenomenon was cannot be categorically asserted; but one probability has often been suggested, and never

proved wrong. In 1603 the astronomer Kepler, observing an extraordinary conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation Pisces, figured back and proved that this same brilliant combination occurred in May, October, and December of 747 A.U.C. or 7 B.C. and that in the following year, 748 A.U.C. or 6 B.C. Mars also joined this conjunction. The calculation has been checked through the centuries by various astronomers and is now admitted by all to be correct.[20] The deduction made from these facts, namely that Christ was born in 748 A.U.C. or 6 B.C., is very likely incorrect; but the error of the deduction arose not from the facts of the phenomena but from their misapplication. If the application of the phenomena is made to facts otherwise known the results are rather startling:

1) Arguing from the date of Herod's death and from the census of Quirinus (Lk. 2:2) it is very likely that Christ's birth took place in 747 A.U.C. or 7 B.C.[21]

2) Since the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn first ensued in May, 747 A.U.C. or 7 B.C., the Magi, being astrologers, possibly observed the star in its "rising" (better than in the "East" as will be explained below). In common speech the "rising" could mean "when it first appeared in May, 747 A.U.C. or 7 B.C.," or "when it first appeared on the horizon on the same date." The latter seems better since they were probably, from their knowledge of the heavens, anticipating the conjunction, were looking for it and saw it as soon as it appeared on the horizon. It is possible that the birth of Christ took place when the conjunction appeared either the first, second or third time, that is, in May, October, or December, 747 A.U.C. or 7 B.C.

3) When the Magi set out for the Judean land we do not know, but that they arrived in Jerusalem sometime within two years after the Child's birth is evident from Mt. 2:7 and 2:16 taken together. The period between May, 747 A.U.C., when the conjunction first appeared and the date in 748 A.U.C., when Mars was added to the conjunction is certainly sometime within a period of two years. The period specified in the gospel and the astronomical period agree remarkably.

4) Suppose that the star did not accompany the Magi from

[20] Alfred Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, Vol. I, pp. 212-3.

[21] Holzmeister, *op. cit.*, p. 29.

their homes in Jerusalem—a supposition which is entirely legitimate since the gospel says nothing about it—then the reappearances of the conjunction in October and December would have encouraged them in their quest.

5) The Magi knew from their study of what was anticipated quite universally, of Daniel's prophecy in particular and of Hebrew prophets in general that the Messias was to be born amongst the Jews, although they may not have known where the little town of Micheas' Bethlehem Ephrata was. Therefore, they betook themselves to Jerusalem, the capitol of the Jews, to get information of the specific locality of the birthplace.

6) They arrived in Jerusalem, then, in 748 A.U.C. or 6 B.C., sometime within two years after the birth; got their information about the locality; and as they left Herod's presence "behold the star which they saw in its rising" (on the horizon Mt. 2:9), now very brilliant because of the addition of Mars to the conjunction. Indeed they had every reason to rejoice exceedingly when they saw the star (Mt. 2:10), for they had an encouraging conviction that their quest was not in vain. The coincidence of the dates, and the dovetailing of gospel facts with what we know about the star conjunction and the character of the Magi, are striking indeed.

But admitting the plausibility of this theory, the commentators who reject it do so on the grounds that the wording of Mt. 2:9 requires a star (*ἀστήρ*) not a conjunction,[22] a moving star (*ἐλθών*) which went before the Magi (*προῆγεν αὐτούς*) and which stopped over the place where the Child was (*ἐστάθη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν τὸ παιδίον*).

It is true that the Vulgate translation requires such an interpretation; but is the Vulgate an accurate rendition of the Greek? *Ἀστήρ* in the New Testament is not restricted to a single star, exclusive of a constellation or some conjunction of planets. It is used in Mt. 24:29 and Mk. 13:25 whose meaning parallels Lk. 21:25 where *ἄστρον*, a constellation, occurs. Nor does it exclude all star phenomena beyond single stars in 1 Cor. 15:41; Apoc. 1:20; 6:13; 8:11,12; 12:4.

Nor does *ἀνατολή* preferably mean the East. Quite the contrary. The plural *ἀνατολαί* is common not only in profane Greek but also in New Testament Greek to signify the East (Mt. 8:11; 24:27; Lk. 13:29). Indeed, Matthew in this very context draws

[22] The Expositor's Greek Testament (ed. Nicoll), p. 70.

attention to the fact that the plural, not the singular, means East (Mt. 2:1). The singular, on the other hand, always means "rising" in the New Testament, except in Apoc. 21:13 (e.g. Apoc. 7:2; 16:12). Therefore "in the East" in vv. 2 and 9 of our text should be "in the rising" and mean "near or on the horizon."

Then, too, the phrase προῆγεν αὐτούς is "kept guiding them forth," "kept inducing them onward," and does not imply any visible forward movement of the star. The reading "went before them" includes two misconceptions and is wrong—that ἄγειν means "to go" and is intransitive; and that προ is the preposition which makes the compound transitive, the προ thereby really governing the αὐτούς. But ἄγειν simply does not mean "to go," but means "to lead, to cause another to go" and being transitive governs the αὐτούς; the προ therefore does not make the compound transitive but merely adds the adverbial notion of "forth, onward." But even supposing that ἄγειν were incorrectly used for the intransitive ἔρχεσθαι "to go" and that προ would then make the compound transitive, the object αὐτούς would be incorrect and would have to be αὐτῶν, the genitive, because προ always, even when in compound with a verb, governs only the genitive. The Greek for what the Vulgate has would have to be προῆλθεν αὐτῶν; but it is προῆγεν αὐτούς and so must be translated by "the star kept inducing them, kept them going onward" or some such phrase.

Next comes the participle ἐλθών. When used with another verb like ἐστάθη it can signify "it came to stand where the Child was," in the sense of the English idiom "it happened to be there, eventually it appeared there." But there is still a better explanation of ἐλθών. When used in reference to stars it means "having risen" as in Odyssey XIII 94. Such, then, can its meaning be here.

Likewise, the expression ἐστάθη ἐπάνω can mean "it stood above" in the sense of high in the sky and can be translated "it stood in the zenith." The sentence, then, will mean: "And behold! the star which they had seen in the rising (near the horizon) kept serving as a guide to them, until, after it had risen, it stood in the zenith (at that locality) where the Child was." The star was seen by the Magi near the eastern horizon when they left Herod. As they went southward toward Bethlehem the star kept approaching its zenith. As long as they saw it, it kept encouraging them forward toward their goal, since the knew

that their quest was not in vain. They saw it in its zenith when they reached Bethlehem where the Child was. The trip of about five miles from Jerusalem to Bethlehem could, with burdened camels, take several hours. The rise of the star from near the horizon to its zenith would take just about that same length of time.

10. "And when they saw the star they rejoiced exceedingly" —with a joy that began as soon as they left Herod's presence. It lasted as long as the star remained in the sky encouraging them.

11. "And entering the house, they found the child with Mary his mother, and falling down they worshipped him. And opening their treasures they offered him gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh."

They worshipped him, at least as a nobleman of high estate. It is not at all certain that they revered Him as God because it is not at all certain that their sources of information—astrology, the prophecies of the Jews or their own sacred books—conveyed His divinity to them although they informed them of His Messiaship. Much more unfounded is the supposition that they had a direct revelation of God about Christ's divinity.

Gold, frankincense, myrrh. The significance usually attached to these gifts—gold indicating that Christ was recognized as their king, frankincense that He was considered their God, myrrh representing that they realised He was true man—are beautiful *post factum* symbolisms, excogitated within the Church, in later times. All three were rich gifts such as a person of high standing would give to another of his own class. Gold certainly was a precious metal, not however used exclusively by kings; incense, amongst the ancients, including the Persians, was used in religious worship but not exclusively, for it was employed, even as it is today especially in the Orient, for perfuming the atmosphere of rooms, private and public. Myrrh, beside its use as a medicament and unguent for corpses, was a perfume.[23] The gifts of the Magi did express their high esteem for the Child as King of the Jews and Messias.

12. "And being warned in a dream not to return to Herod, they went back to their own country by another way."

[23] Kitto, *op. cit.*, *s.vv.* "Gold, Frankincense, Myrrh"; see also Ps. 44:9; Esth. 2:12; Cant. 4:6.

The Magi certainly took a road which avoided Jerusalem; they likely went to Damascus as their starting point across the Syrian desert. Now between Bethlehem and Damascus there were several roads which avoided Jerusalem, one along the west bank of the Jordan, another through Transjordan. The Transjordan route was probably the one they took, crossing the Jordan about four miles north of the Dead Sea.

Thus did Providence, whether through miraculous intervention or through the instrumentality of a natural phenomenon plus the learning of sincere sages, guide Gentiles of good will for the first time in history to the feet of the Truth Incarnate.

West Baden College
West Baden Springs, Indiana

JEROME AGAINST JEROME

A Study of Jeremias 3:1

Rev. Patrick Cummins, O.S.B., S.T.D.

The Cleveland convention has clarified our Old Testament revision problem. We are to follow the Vulgate, yes, but we are not bound by any existing edition of the Vulgate. We are free to appeal to the manuscripts which underlie the editions. We are urged to find, wherever we may, the exact Latin form under which St. Jerome rendered the *Hebraica Veritas* of his time.

In the light of this clarification, revisers, I doubt not, are reexamining their revisions. Both the revision board and the editors of the Quarterly have frequently urged us to pool our revising experiences. Since I feel deeply the value I would derive from knowing how other revisers have solved their problems, let me at least show good will by asking help in one of my own puzzles.

I refer to the words *et ego suscipiam te,* which conclude the first verse of chapter three in Jeremias. Hetzenauer prints the verse as follows:

Vulgo dicitur: Si dimiserit vir uxorem suam, et recedens ab eo, duxerit virum alterum: numquid revertetur ad eam ultra? numquid non polluta, et contaminata erit mulier illa? tu autem fornicata es cum amatoribus multis: tamen revertere ad me, dicit Dominus, et ego suscipiam te.

Those four concluding words *et ego suscipiam te*—are they genuine? Were they part of St. Jerome's original translation from the Hebrew of his time? If so, are they a translation of Hebrew words? Or are they instead a gloss, added by Jerome to clarify the meaning of the original? Or finally, supposing them to be a gloss, was this gloss added by someone else to the Saint's translation?

To facilitate discussion, let us have before us an outline of the first sermon given in the present book of Jeremias. I entitle this sermon: *The False Wife.* It begins with the first verse of chapter two and ends with the fifth verse of chapter three. Its contents I give as follows:

The young bride (2:1-3),
who rebelled (2:4-8),
with folly unheard of (2:9-13);

who, though despoiled (2:14-19),
is still a hypocrite (2:20-28),
still blind (2:29-37),
still a false bride (3:1-5).

Jeremias pictures the chosen people as a rebellious and repudiated bride (Deut. 24:1-4. Cf. Mt. 5:31; 19:7; Mk. 10:4). When a wife has been divorced, and has married another man, Jewish law forbids her former husband to take her again to wife. How then shall Juda return to Yahweh?

If this position be granted, we see that the first verse of chapter three, quoted at the beginning of this paper, is the key-note of the sermon. Hence the need of special care in establishing the exact wording of this verse. Let me put down here, in parallel columns, the Douay Version and my revision. The remainder of this article will defend the revision proposed.

Douay Version	*My revision*
a) It is commonly said:	a) It is commonly said:
b) If a man put away his wife,	b) If a man put away his wife,
c) and she go from him	c) and she go from him,
d) and marry another man,	d) and marry another man,
e) shall he return to her any more?	e) can she return to him again?
f) shall not that woman be polluted and defiled?	f) would the land not be defiled and profaned?
g) but thou hast prostituted thyself to many lovers;	g) Now thou hast sinned with many lovers:
h) nevertheless return to me, saith the Lord,	h) shalt thou then return to me, saith the Lord?
i) and I will receive thee.	i) .....

DEFENSE OF PROPOSED REVISION

The change most in need of defense is the omission of the last sentence in Douay. On this point I shall dwell, after a brief glance at the *incisa* that precede it.

a) *It is commonly said.* The Hebrew has a hanging infinitive, introduced by a preposition (לֵאמֹר). St. Jerome's *Vulgo dicitur* seems to be a conjecture. My conjecture is that this infinitive was originally preceded by some such words as these: Doth not the Law speak, (saying)? But since some conjecture we must have, let St. Jerome's conjecture stand.

e) *Can she return to him again?* Thus the Septuagint text (see Swete and Nestle). This reading is supported by the tenor of this entire first sermon. How can Juda return? That is the question. Juda is a false wife, foolish, hypocritical, blind. The Law (Deut. 24:4) forbids her former husband (Yahweh) to take her again to wife. How, then, can she return?

Question: Do our principles allow us to favor LXX against MT and V? The principle runs thus (I, b): The sense of the Vulgate when uncertain may and should be clarified by means of its originals. Is LXX included in these "originals"? Pending the decision of the editorial board, I would say, Yes. St. Jerome, with all his preference for the Hebrew, still kept LXX constantly in mind. The variant readings (in parenthesis) of his commentary on Jeremias (his last work) are almost invariably from LXX. Kittel here corrects MT by LXX.

f) *Would the land not be defiled and profaned?* V has "woman" instead of "land." St. Jerome[1] here followed LXX against H. Kittel again corrects MT by LXX. But here I fail to see why. If the Deuteronomic law be the reason for preferring e), it is likewise reason for preferring f).[2] And St. Jerome[3] says explicitly that his H had "land," not "woman."

h) *Shalt thou then return to me, saith the Lord?* Thus LXX, as St. Jerome maintains. But H (תשוב) is to be translated in the same way, as an ironical question.

i) (*And I will receive thee*). Two preliminaries are clear:

1) No extant Hebrew text has the words.

2) No extant Greek text has the words.

Hence if we are to retain the words we must find strong evidence in the Vulgate tradition. a) Did St. Jerome find equivalent words in the Hebrew of his time? b) If not, did he add the words as a gloss, to guarantee that the Latin reader would not miss the meaning of the sentence? c) Further, if he actually wrote the words into his translation, why were they omitted by copyists? d) And, alternatively, if the words were not in St.

[1] In his translation of the text (MPL 28; 852).

[2] Non poterit prior maritus recipere eam in uxorem: quia polluta est, et abominabilis facta est coram Domino: ne peccare facias Terram tuam, quam Dominus Deus tuus tradiderit tibi possidendam (Deut. 24:4, according to Hetzenauer).

[3] In his commentary (MPL 24, 699).

Jerome's manuscript, why were they later inserted in many copies? Let us briefly discuss these possibilities.

a) Jerome's Hebrew text contained the equivalent of *et ego suscipiam te.* Vallarsi sponsors this view. He prints indeed Jerome's translation without our *incisum.*[4] And in the note below he says that the *incisum* is not to be found in the better Latin MSS.[5] But in that same note he goes on to prove that Jerome found the verbal equivalent of our *incisum* in the Hebrew of his time. His argument rests on two citations from St. Jerome. Let us examine them separately.

In his *Epistola ad Rusticum* (*circa* 408), Jerome writes as follows:

> O clementia Dei! O nostra duritia! dum et post tanta scelera nos provocat ad salutem. Et ne sic quidem volumus ad meliora converti: Si reliquerit, inquit, uxor virum suum, et alii nupserit, et voluerit postea reverti ad eum: numquid suscipiet eam, et non detestabitur (Jer. 3:1)? Pro quo scriptum est juxta Hebraicam Veritatem, quod in graecis et latinis codicibus non habetur: Et tu reliquisti me, tamen convertere, et suscipiam te, dicit Dominus.[6]

This passage, if it be accepted as proving that *et suscipiam te* was part of Jerome's translation, must likewise be accepted as proving that *et tu reliquisti me* was also part of his translation. For this conclusion, no MS in any language, no edition, no scholar, gives you a shred of evidence. Equivalently, in sense, *reliquisti* is contained in *fornicata es.* But the word itself, the verb *relinquere,* has no existence in this verse. Hence the same conclusion must hold good for the words *suscipiam* (*suscipere*). The word does not belong to the passage, but the meaning of the passage includes, by implication, an equivalent of the word.

Now look at the second passage, quoted by Vallarsi from Jerome's commentary (*circa* 420). "In Hebraeco etiam post fornicationem suscipit poenitentem, et hortatur ut revertatur ad se. In LXX vero, non provocat ad poenitentiam, sed arguit impuden-

[4] MPL 28, 852.

[5] This phrase "the better Latin MSS" needs watching. Höpfl used the phrase in defending the Codex Carafianus ("Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Sixto-Klem. Vulgata," *Bibl. Studien,* XVIII, p. 138, n. 3). We do not find herein a contradiction, as Höpfl is not speaking explicitly of our *incisum.* But Vallarsi's "better MSS" do not have our *incisum,* while Carafianus, based on Höpfl's "better MSS," does have our *incisum.* I may add that Höpfl bases his note explicitly on the collations of the Vulgate Commission.

[6] MPL 22, 1041-1042 (Ep. CXXII).

tiam meretricis, quod post adulterium reverti audeat ad maritum."[7]

Notice the phrase *post fornicationem suscipit.* He is not quoting, but commenting, interpreting. Writing to Rusticus, he interpreted *fornicata es* by *et tu reliquisti me.* In both cases the verb *suscipere* (*suscipiam* in one case, *suscipit* in the other) represents the meaning of the passage, not the wording.

b) *The words are a gloss.* This is the position of Martianay.[8] St. Jerome's words, read carefully, do indeed show that he found in our verse the meaning of the words *et ego suscipiam te,* but they do not show that he had equivalent *Hebrew words* before him.

But when we call the words a gloss, do we mean a gloss inserted by St. Jerome in his own translation, or a gloss inserted later by a copyist or a corrector? Each view may be supported. In favor of the first view stand the two citations given above from St. Jerome himself. Note that *suscipiam* (to Rusticus) is reiterated by *suscipit* in the commentary. Such insistence in a man who, as his works show, knew the Bible, Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, practically by heart—such reiteration seems hardly intelligible if he had not read the word in some text. In what text? His own. The words have no history in any other text.

On the other hand, supposing that the gloss belongs to Jerome himself, two great difficulties arise. First, from St. Jerome's commentary.[9] There the text commented on does not have the words in question. This absence of our *incisum* in the commentary text is as old as Rabanus Maurus.[10]

Second difficulty. If the words stood in St. Jerome's own translation, how explain their omission in many manuscripts? We must remember that Jerome translated all the prophets *per cola et commata.*[11] Our *incisum,* then, would have had its own special line. A copyist may easily misread within the limits of a line. Compare 'Jacob' instead of 'Jaboc' (Gen. 32:22) in the three main MSS of the Vulgate Commission. But that the copy-

[7] MPL 24, 699.

[8] Quoted by Vallarsi, in his note below text cited above from Jerome's letter to Rusticus (see note 6).

[9] See notes 3 and 7.

[10] MPL 111, 824. Rabanus died in 856.

[11] See Jerome's prologue to his translation of Isaias (MPL 28, 771).

ist's eye, compelled to shift constantly from original to his own page, can still miss a line—this is hard to admit.

Here I must answer a counter question. Let us suppose that our *incisum* is indeed a gloss, but not a gloss added by St. Jerome. Then the question arises: If the words were not in St. Jerome's translation, why were they inserted in later copies? When were they inserted? And by whom?

The last two questions I cannot answer. Samuel Berger,[12] discussing the text of the Bible of Tours, finds our *incisum* present in two of these Bibles, absent in six. It is present in the Codex Rorigonis, a MS of the ninth century, collated by the Vulgate Commission (R). This codex, says the commission, was written before 841, and was presented by Count Rorigon of Mans to the Abbey of St. Maur in Glanfeuil. Later it passed to St. Maur des Fosses, and is now in the National Library of Paris (Parisinus lat. 3).

Who made this copy for Rorigon? Did this copyist find the words in the exemplar which he copied? When did the *incisum* enter the text? I know not. Perhaps some master does. If so, I beg he may tell us. In the labyrinthine roads of Vulgate transmission the history of this *incisum* may become Ariadne's thread.

Why was it inserted? One hypothesis emerges. Someone, not a mere copyist, but a fair scholar, had read St. Jerome's commentary, or his letter to Rusticus, or both. Rather he misread them. Jerome was insisting on the meaning. His vigorous language led his reader to think he was speaking of the text.

To recapitulate. The problem lies in the Vulgate tradition. If the words were a part of St. Jerome's own MS, we simply cannot explain why some copyists omitted them. One explanation therefore, and only one, meets all reasonable demands. The words are not a part of Jerome's translation. They were added later. The reason is easy to see. The copyist (or corrector) had read St. Jerome's commentary, or his letter to Rusticus, or both. We must excuse him for misinterpreting texts which, nigh a thousand years later, were misinterpreted even by such a master as Vallarsi.

Conception Abbey
Conception, Missouri

[12] *Histoire de la Vulgate*, p. 230.

A DISCUSSION OF GENESIS 4:7

Rev. Edward A. Mangan, C.Ss.R., S.S.L.

One of the most intriguing sentences in the Bible is the seventh verse of the fourth chapter of Genesis. Though some interpreters wish to see in the verse merely a symbolic expression of the inner workings of Cain's conscience, I prefer to think God actually spoke in some way to Cain. And my discussion of the text will be aimed at trying to deduce from the text at hand an objective and as clear as possible a meaning of the question put by God to Cain just before his act of murder.

1. The Text

The Hebrew Text is: "If you do well, will there not be a raising (שְׂאֵת), or elevation (to you); but if you do not do well, will not sin be creeping (crouching) at the door? To you is (or will be) its (or his) concupiscence but you will overpower it (or him)."

The Greek Text reads: "Do you not sin by offering well indeed, but dividing wrong? Silence! His concupiscence is towards you and you will overpower him."

It is not easy to find the Hebrew text upon which the Greek is based. However in all probability the translators read רְבַץ "be silent," an imperative, instead of רֹבֵץ "crouching," a participle; and also they read חָטָאתָ a verb, "thou hast sinned" instead of חַטָּאת "sin," a noun.

The Vulgate seems to be a mixture of the Hebrew and the Greek. The Vulgate reads "Nonne, si bene egeris, recipies; sin autem male, statim in foribus peccatum aderit? Sed sub te erit appetitus ejus, et tu dominaberis illius."

The Greek text insinuates that Cain's sin was an act of dividing wrongly. Both the Septuagint and the Vulgate lack coherence. What is the subject to which "he" and "him" refer? Is it "sin" personified or "Abel"? And in the Vulgate what does "accipies" or "recipies" mean and to what does it refer?

Looking at the context of the whole passage, to us it seems clear that God wishes to say something like this: "You go around sad because you have done wrong; if you do right you will lift up your countenance; if you do not do right, sin will be at the door of your heart, although you can overcome its attraction and conquer."

Let us then take the Hebrew text as it stands and see what we can make out of it.

1. The word שְׂאֵת evidently refers to "face" or "head." One of these two words was in the original text or was understood to go with שְׂאֵת. As a drooping countenance is the external sign of Cain's bad disposition, a feeling of enmity or jealousy, so as a consequence of his change of disposition, a lifting up of the head or face will come and at the same time will be the external sign of his inner good disposition.

2. The pronouns "he" and "him" refer back to "sin," not to "Abel." Though the word "sin" is feminine, yet since there is an evident reference here to the serpent in chapter 3 of Genesis, the author, in referring back ot "sin," personifies it and places the pronouns harking back to it in the masculine gender.

3. The word תְּשׁוּקָתוֹ "its" or "his concupiscence" is the same word used in Gen. 3:16. There the word is used to mean Eve's desire or concupiscence toward Adam. Here in our passage, the same word used in referring to the relation of sin toward Cain, means that there is a great leaning of sin toward Cain and of Cain towards sin, which however he is able to overcome.

Therefore we translate the passage thus: "If you do right will not your face be lifted (not fallen); but if you do not do right (i.e., if you do not get rid of your envious thoughts) will not sin (of murder) be crouching at the door of your heart. Though its desire is on you, you (nevertheless) will have power over it."

Murillo agrees substantially with this translation since he asserts that the "sin" does not mean a sin already committed but one to be committed.[1]

Heinisch[2] seems to lean to the opinion that "him" and "his" refer to Abel; and W. P. Paterson[3] in his article on "Cain" in Hastings' Dictionary of the Bible mentions this opinion favorably.

Hummelauer[4] decides definitely for this and says the last part of the sentence therefore means that God promises Cain the primogeniture if he repents.

[1] L. Murillo, *El Genesis* (Rome: 1914), p. 330.
[2] Dr. Paul Heinisch, *Das Buch Genesis*, (Bonn: 1930), p. 145.
[3] W. P. Paterson, "Cain" in *Dict. of the Bible* by Hastings, Vol. I, p. 336.
[4] Hummelauer: "Genesis" in *Cursus Script. Sacrae*, p. 179.

2. Explanation

The meaning that we have decided on in our translation seems to agree best with the context of the whole passage. We give here then the whole passage in our own paraphrase.

1. Verse 5: God shows in some way his acceptance of Abel's offering and his displeasure at Cain's. The reason for God's discrimination is explained by St. Paul in Hebrews 11:4. Abel's inner dispositions were pleasing to God, Cain's not. How did God show His acceptance? Possibly by sending fire from heaven to burn up Abel's offering. Cf. Lev. 9:24; Jdgs. 6:21; 3 Kgs. 18:38. Cain is not godless entirely. That God is displeased with him makes him sad. Then he gives himself over to dark thoughts of hate and envy.

2. Verse 6: God tries to warn him. He shows that he knows Cain's evil thoughts.

3. Verse 7: God further shows what will be the result if Cain continues to nurse his anger and envy. The terrible sin of murder, which is already taking shape in his plans, is already crouching ready to leap into his soul, will actually take place. This warning shows the love of God for Cain.

3. Liberty of Will

In any case, whatever be the true meaning of verse 7, whether God is warning Cain against a future sin of murder or is actually promising a reward such as primogeniture if Cain imitates Abel and offers with better intentions, the last phrase of verse 7 "you will dominate over it (over him)" is a clear proof that these first men enjoyed perfect liberty of will. They were no half animals just emerging into the light of reason and the first dawnings of what we are pleased to call liberty of will.

They had a clear sense of moral right and wrong. Conscience sounded to Cain, the first murderer, clearly as a sharp sound of a bell, unmistakable, not confused. In this story there is evidence of clear knowledge and full and complete deliberation. The first men of the Bible, the primitives of time, if we wish to call them so, are clearly portrayed by God as men with concise and definite moral ideas and a full realization of their own liberty of action.

Redemptorist Seminary
Oconomowoc, Wisconsin

MISSAL EPISTLES FROM ROMANS

XIII

Rev. Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

The following passage is the epistle for the third Sunday after the Epiphany:

12:16,17 Be not wise in your own conceits. | To no man render evil for evil, but provide good things not only in the sight of God, but also in the sight of all men.
18 If it be possible, as far as in you lies, be at peace with
19 all men. Do not avenge yourselves, but give place to the wrath, for it is written.
"Vengeance is mine: I will repay, says the Lord."
20 But
"If thy enemy is hungry, give him food;
if he is thirsty, give him drink;
For by so doing thou wilt heap coals of fire
upon his head."
21 Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good.

The foregoing passage follows immediately on the passage which is the epistle for the second Sunday after the Epiphany,[1] and treats of the same subject, charity, more particularly of charity towards those who are not of the household of the faith.

Be not wise in your own conceits. He is wise in his own conceits who thinks that he has nothing to learn from his fellow men or from God. He has, in his own estimation, ample knowledge to care for all his needs. Such a man is, in the words of St. Thomas, a victim of *praesumptio sapientiae et prudentiae.* Such were certain pagans of St. Paul's day who *while professing to be wise, have become fools* (Rom. 1:22). Of this type of man, of whom unfortunately there are plenty in the world today as regards religious and philosophical truth, Origen remarks: "He who worships his own stupidity as wisdom, cannot know the true wisdom of God."

To no man render evil for evil. The early Christians had much to suffer in the Jewish or pagan environment in which they lived. To the strong promptings of human nature to avenge itself of injustice, our Lord and the Apostles both by word and example opposed the sublime ideal of Christianity (Mt. 5:43-44; 1 Pet.

[1] This was explained in the October, 1943 *Quarterly,* Vol. V, pp. 458-465.

3:9; 1 Thess. 5:15) to love and pray for those who persecute and calumniate us. Origen remarks that to render evil for evil may well be a greater sin than that of the one who first inflicts evil, for the victim of the ill treatment recognizes the evil he returns, but he who inflicted it may have had no consciousness of evil doing. Thus, no doubt, many a Jew who persecuted the Christians did so out of a sense of duty, as was certainly the case with St. Paul, and many a pagan persecutor may well have regarded it as his patriotic duty to stamp out the Christian religion, which he in good faith considered anti-social and opposed to the best interests of the state. So it may be with many a present day opponent of Christianity.

But provide good things not only in the sight of God but also in the sight of all men.[2] The good things are actions which are not only morally right and therefore good in the sight of God, but which at the same time will give no offence to men. Thus, at times, as St. Paul points out more than once (1 Cor. 8:9 ff.; 10:23 ff. Rom. 14:12 ff.), we may have to refrain from an action which, while it is morally good and permissible in itself, will be taken amiss, misunderstood or be offensive to others. St. Paul, in counseling the Romans to avoid anything that might bring them into disrepute in the eyes of the Jews or pagans, does not, of course, approve of any compromise in matters of faith or morals. And this he makes clear when he writes:

If it be possible, as far as in you lies, be at peace with all men. St. Paul recognized that peace is not always possible between individuals, since it depends on both parties doing their duty. The same principle may be extended to nations, and therefore St. Paul was not an advocate of peace at any price. The individual Christian must do all in his power for peace with his fellow men, but as St. John Chrysostom says:

If you see the cause of religion suffering anywhere, do not set greater store by concord than truth, but make a noble stand even unto death. Even then be not at war in soul, but fight only against things. Be friendly in mind without giving up the truth at any time.

Regrettable as are personal conflicts and horrible as is war between nations, there are worse evils, namely falsehood and injustice. When, therefore, friendship can be preserved between individuals only by yielding to evil, peace and amity are to be unhesitatingly sacrificed, and when war is the only means of se-

[2] The Greek text here reads: *Provide good things in the sight of all men.*

curing justice, nations are not merely permitted but are obliged to have recourse to it, whenever the injustice is proportionately serious and there is well founded hope that war will suppress it. If this doctrine seems to be contradicted by the direction not to avenge oneself, we say that such advice is given to individuals and concerns personal wrongs, and not to governments which have the duty of protecting the interests of their subjects.

Do not avenge yourselves, beloved, but give place to the wrath, for it is written. "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, says the Lord."

Since St. Paul is asking what is very hard for human nature, he shows a great tenderness of feeling by addressing his readers as *beloved.* His advice is the surest way of preserving peace. The wrath here mentioned is the divine wrath, which is an anthropomorphic way of expressing God's punishment on sin. The citation from Deuteronomy clearly indicates the sense in which the wrath is to be understood.

Then follows a citation from Proverbs, 25:21-22, which needs no comment. The meaning of heaping coals of fire on one's head is according to the commonly accepted view that by overwhelming an enemy with kindness, one will make him burn with shame and thus bring him to better sentiments.[3]

Be not overcome by evil, but overcome evil with good. He is overcome by evil who yields to the natural tendency to avenge himself and inflicts evil for evil. He who returns good for evil overcomes evil by good at least to the extent that the evil is not multiplied; and such kind treatment may even expel evil from an enemy's heart.

XIV

The following passage is the epistle for the fourth Sunday after the Epiphany:

13:8 Owe no man anything except to love one another; for
9 he who loves his neighbor has fulfilled the Law. For
"Thou shalt not commit adultery;

[3] Some think that forbearance heaps coals of fire on one's persecutor's head by increasing his punishment unless he repent, but as St. Augustine points out, this interpretation is out of harmony with the context, which urges to love. To give food and drink to one's persecutor with a view of adding to his punishment in the next life is certainly not in keeping with the fraternal charity St. Paul advocates.

Thou shalt not kill;
Thou shalt not steal;
Thou shalt not covet";
10 and if there is any other commandment, it is summed up in this saying:
"Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thy self."

St. Paul interrupts his treatment of charity, excerpts from which form the epistles for the second and third Sundays after the Epiphany, to interpose a paragraph on obedience to the civil authorities. He concludes the paragraph by stating the principle of justice: to render to every man his due, tribute, taxes, reverence and honor to whom they may be owing. That suggests the idea of the debt which can never fully be discharged—love.

St. Thomas in his commentary on the passage writes:

Above the Apostle showed how the faithful ought to observe justice towards superiors; here he shows what they should render to all men. And concerning this he first sets down his thesis, and secondly he gives the reason. It was said, "Give to all their due," not partially but entirely. And to this he adds, saying, "Owe no man anything," as if he should say, "so pay all debts to all men that nothing remains to be paid." And this for two reasons, first, because in delaying payment sin is committed, since one unjustly holds what belongs to another. Therefore Leviticus 19 says: "The wages of him that hath been hired by thee shall not abide with thee until the morning." The same holds for debts due to others. Secondly, because as long as a man is in debt, he is in a certain way a slave and is bound to him whom he owes. "The borrower is servant to him that lendeth," says Proverbs. But there are certain debts from which a man can never free himself. This happens in two ways. In one way because of the excellence of the benefit for which no equivalent return can be made. As the Philosopher says of the honor which is due to God or to parents, according to the Psalmist, "What shall I render to the Lord for all that He has rendered to me." In another way because of the cause of the debt which abides always, or because of this that what is rendered is never exhausted but in the rendering increases. And for these reasons the debt of love is so paid that it always remains due. First, because we owe love to the neighbor for God's sake to whom we can never make sufficient return.... Secondly because the cause of love always remains which is the similitude of nature and of grace. "Every beast loveth its like; so also every man him that is nearest to him." Thirdly because love in loving fails not.

He who loves his fellow man fulfills the Law for as long as love abides one cannot transgress the commandments of God relative to the neighbor. St. Paul here cites some of the precepts of the decalogue as examples. The differing order of the command-

ments is due to the variation in certain ancient manuscripts, and not, as some have suggested, to the fact that adultery was very prevalent among the Romans, and St. Paul therefore wished to emphasize its prohibition by putting it first among the commandments he quotes. The Hebrew and Latin texts of Ex. 20:13 ff. and Deut. 5:17 ff., which contain the commandments, have them in the order familiar to us from the catechism, but certain ancient Greek manuscripts, Philo and Clement of Alexandria, give them in the order which St. Paul has here.

Wonderment is sometimes expressed why there is no mention of the love of God by St. Paul in this context, in accord with the statement of our Lord on the two commandments—love of God and love of the neighbor—on which the whole law depends (Mt. 22:34-40). St. Augustine answers that genuine love of the neighbor is impossible without the love of God. The one supposes the other; they are inseparable. *Ex una eademque caritate Deum proximumque diligimus, sed Deus propter Deum, nos autem et proximum propter Deum.* Or in the scholastic language of St. Thomas: "In the love of the neighbor the love of God is included as a cause is contained in its effect, and in the love of God the love of the neighbor is included as the effect is contained in its cause."

St. Thomas also remarks that the negative precepts are given in proof of St. Paul's thesis because refraining from evil is a more obvious proof of love than the placing of benevolent acts, and because the negative precepts are more universal, binding always and in regard to all persons—*semper et pro semper* as the theologians say—whereas the positive precepts bind only on occasion.

The concluding verse of this excerpts is the conclusion of a syllogism of which the first verse is the major, the second the minor and the third the conclusion, all which St. Thomas expresses as follows:

Major: He who loves the neighbor does him no evil.

Minor: But every precept of the decalogue is directed to this that one abstain from evil.

Conclusion: Therefore he who loves the neighbor has fulfilled the law.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

OBSCURITIES IN THE LATIN PSALTER

Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.

XXI

132. Psalm 138:16c-d. (Friday, at Vespers.)

Imperfectum meum viderunt oculi tui, et in libro tuo omnes scribentur: *dies formabuntur, et nemo in eis.*

MT is clearly identical with the original of LXX; the roots of obscurity are trifling in themselves, and opinion of the sense is practically unanimous. Verses 4-5 have confessed God's foreknowledge of the future, and 13-15 have ascribed to Him perfect comprehension of the secrets of nature. The two themes seem to meet in the present verse. Contemplating His creature as yet unborn, the Creator has at the same moment seen, as it were involved there, the allotted number of the Psalmist's days, and the fashion of each of them in detail. All of this is written in His book—the same idea which we find reflected in Ex. 32:32; Ps. 55:9 (as formerly explained);[1] 68:29; Isa. 4:3, and elsewhere. The whole destiny of the immature form was predetermined inasmuch as it was foreseen. All of us can recall how often the Wisdom literature, in ascribing to God alone the sovereign power to create, insists on penetrating behind all-powerful volition to flawless understanding.

Omnes in the second member seems to lack an antecedent (since *imperfectum* is in the singular), but its Hebrew original, "all of them," may perhaps look forward to *dies,* in the third member, and the latter be further connected with *formabuntur* by a suppressed relative—a not uncommon syntactic trait, especially in poetry. The verbs *scribentur* and *formabuntur,* in the Hebrew imperfect, are really rather present than future in time, either as expressing a constant mode of operation, or as following it, in the Psalmist's particular case, through a career not yet completed. *Nemo* derives its personal flavor from the gender in LXX, but is really two Hebrew words "not one" (i.e. of the "days"). The "not" was questioned by the Massoretes themselves, in a marginal notation, as a case of the familiar confusion between the negative particle "not" and the prepositional phrase

[1] *C.B.Q.* II, 3, p. 256.

"to or for him (it)"—already noted in Ps. 99:3b,[2] where "to him" should prevail. But "not" is correct in the present case, apart from the fact that the other reading would make no sense. Finally, *in eis* means "among them," or equivalently "of them," after "not one."

Jerome's version from the Hebrew has, for the third member, *dies formati sunt, et non est una in eis.* Bird, Boylan and Zorell agree in this general sense. Briggs agrees except in construction, preferring the suppressed relative, suggested above, as subject of "are formed," and making *dies* the postponed antecedent of "all of them" in the preceding member. This seems a more complete explanation. Zorell, it may be observed, once proposed a somewhat different rendering;[3] but since this appeared in 1923, and was not followed in either of the subsequent editions of his *Psalterium,* we neglect it in favor of the latter's present conclusion as stated above.

General consent, therefore, would explain the passage thus:

My unformed state Thine eyes have seen;
and in Thy book are all of them written,
days that are fashioned when not one of them is.

133. Psalm 138:18b. (Friday, at Vespers.)

Dinumerabo eos, et super arenam multiplicabuntur: *exsurrexi, et adhuc sum tecum.*

"Should I count them, they would outnumber the sand," seems to offer little introduction to what follows. The second member, however, is quite literally rendered, and is probably a separate sentence. *Exsurrexi* is, perhaps, more strictly *evigilavi,* since the Hebrew verb invariably signifies the return to full consciousness from sleep or some such state—not, for instance, taking an erect position or a higher level. Though the sense of the sentence as we have it is commonly accepted, its pertinence is not clear. Perhaps the thought of 16a still lingers beneath, or is resumed after interruption, and "awoke" is a metaphor—when I came to light at birth, the scrutinizing presence continued unaffected. Whether or not this is the link in the thought, we can but let the words speak for themselves:

[2] *C.B.Q.* IV, p. 353. [3] *Biblica* IV, pp. 315 ff.

Should I count them, they would outnumber the sand.
I have awakened, and still I am with Thee.

134. Psalm 138:20. (Friday, at Vespers.)

Quia dicitis in cogitatione: Accipient in vanitate civitates tuas.

Whatever one's desire to be objective, much must depend on individual judgment here. The authors of LXX did not fully understand the text before them. Moreover, the chief MSS of LXX vary widely, and so do those of MT. V departs from LXX in making *dicitis* plural for a second person singular, while MT. has a third person plural. The text is clearly somewhat corrupt.

At any rate, verses 19 and 21 are clear, and both express the Psalmist's loathing of the impious and their arrogance. The question in 20 is, on just what account? The first verb, following *quia,* is probably some form of "say" or "mention," but cannot be in second person. A needed letter absent from many MSS is present in others, and may be accepted. An object suffix makes it "they mention Thee" or "they speak of Thee." The next Hebrew form is a phrase of purpose or end, beginning with "for," and is so read by LXX, whereas V makes the *in* govern an ablative and lose its true force. *Cogitatio* expresses the general meaning of a Hebrew noun having, among others, a sinister application evidently uppermost here: "for devising" or "plotting." The first member may best be rendered, "for they speak of Thee wickedly."

This would lead us to presume a closer parallel than "they will take Thy cities vainly." Open hostility, except in words, does not seem to be intended. The original of *accipient* is ambiguous only in grammatical form. Barring one improbable and little approved alternative reading, the radicals are clearly those of the very frequent verb "take," including "take up," "lift," "take away," and finally "utter," either as "taking up" a subject of discourse or as "lifting" one's voice in solemn or emphatic assertion. (It is the root of the prophetical expression rendered by some "oracle" and by others "burden.") As to its morphology, it might, without the present vowels, be (a) an infinitive absolute, a sort of loosely construed gerund; (b) a passive participle, perhaps in the indefinite construction "there is a taking"

LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL

or "a being taken," like the familiar "something burnt, something offered" in Mal. 1:11; (c) with interchange of the last two letters, a simple perfect in the plural. On all accounts, therefore, "they take." *In vanitate* comes to our aid with an idiomatic tie. Following "take" in its present construction, it forms the stereotyped phrase "take in vain," or "mention for nothing," used in the Decalogue and elsewhere.

The last word, original of *civitates tuas,* is perhaps the most difficult of all. In Hebrew it occupies the regular place of the subject after a finite verb; but if the subject is included (as just previously mentioned) in the form of the verb, the word serves equally well as direct object of "take in vain." In either construction it has the suffix "Thy." Bird and Boylan would correct it to "name," but this changes two letters out of three, and to others not easily confused with the ones at hand; while if the original had read "take in vain Thy name," it is hard to conjecture how any scribe would have been led to write something different. Others, with an easier change of but one letter, would read a preposition, "against Thee," the construction requiring no object. At all events, it can hardly be "Thy cities," as read by LXX.

Some read it as "Thine enemies" and as subject of "utter vanity." Moderns acknowledge this word for "enemies" as occurring only twice, and as textually doubtful both times, while they cannot account for its derivation. Jerome's authority, however, lends it countenance; he renders the verse, *Quia contradicent tibi scelerate: elati* [*al. elevati*] *sunt, frustra adversarii tui.* Either this rendering would seem to be most probable, or perhaps the one suggested above:

For they speak of Thee wickedly,
and utter things in vain against Thee.

135. Psalm 139:10. (Friday, at Vespers.)

Caput circuitus eorum: labor labiorum ipsorum operiet eos.

Except for *eorum,* which apparently should be *mei,* LXX is verbally faithful, but inexact in reproducing the sequence of thought. Before pursuing this line further, two complications of it may be mentioned for dismissal. One arises from Jerome's

version, *amaritudo convivarum meorum,* which instead of "head" supposes a less frequent noun of the same form meaning "poison." This is neither necessary nor confirmed by other witness. The second is a suggestion of Bird and Boylan, that "head" might be transferred to the end of verse 9 with improvement to metrical division. The sense, too, would seem to benefit somewhat. But the transposition meets with an obstacle in the rubrical word *selah,* which follows the present ending of verse 9, leaving "head" where we have it. This circumstance is duly weighed by Bird, while Boylan prefers to transfer *selah* as well as "head"—too much conjecture, unless stronger reasons demanded it.

The rest is due to natural flexibility in the Hebrew forms. *Circuitus* is indeed a substantive, but with a collective bent, "my surroundings" regarded as "my surrounders." The original of *labor* is more specifically "trouble" than merely "toil." That of *operiet* quite commonly means "overwhelm," and its construction is probably "jussive" or "volitive subjunctive." Finally, as the text stands, *caput* and *eos* appear to form a double accusative, *eos* being properly the direct object of *operiet,* while *caput* is accusative "of the part affected"[4] or "of limitation,"[5] amounting to "on the head," anticipated in the order of the words, but not without parallel, especially in poetry. We should thus have

Upon the head of them that surround me
let the mischief of their own lips overwhelm them.

(*To be continued*)

Woodstock College
Woodstock, Maryland

[4] Cowley, 117*ll.*
[5] Joüon, 126*g.*

CORRESPONDENCE

This department has been inaugurated to afford our readers an opportunity to express their views on scriptural topics, whether they have been discussed in the QUARTERLY or not. Publication of these views does not imply that they are endorsed by the editors; they remain the private views of the writers, who alone are to be held accountable for them. Queries of sufficient interest and importance will also be answered.

WHO CRUCIFIED JESUS?—A REPLY TO A CRITIC

EDITORS: As a student of rabbinics, reading the Gospels from the historical angle, I was puzzled very much. I know that blasphemy, according to the Jewish law, was not punishable by death. Only when a person cursed God with the name of God was he guilty of a capital crime and was put to death. By claiming to be the son of God Jesus was not liable to capital punishment. I was more perplexed by the statement of the Gospel, according to John, that the Jews had no right to put any man to death. From Josephus we infer that the Romans did not interfere with the religious customs of the Jews, since it was the policy of the Romans not to intervene in the religious and cultural life of the peoples whom they conquered. Again, I questioned why Jesus was brought to the house of the high priest when the ordinary procedure would have been to bring him to the court house where the Sanhedrin tried their cases. We know that the Sanhedrin had its own special places where it held court. Jesus, according to the Gospels, was arrested in accordance with a plan laid several days before his arrest. Why was it necessary to bring Jesus to the house of the high priest and assemble the Sanhedrin there? Again, reading the Gospels, I wondered how the Sanhedrin could try a case at night or on a holyday. According to early rabbinic sources no cases were tried at night or on a holyday. Making a historical study of the Gospels and of the history of the Jews of that time, I came to the conclusion that there were in truth two Sanhedrins. One was a religious court which tried those who committed religious crimes. This Sanhedrin consisted of scholars, and we have an account of this Sanhedrin in the Talmud. There was another Sanhedrin, a state court, which tried those who transgressed against the State. The head of this Sanhedrin was the ruler of the Jews. In the early days of the Jewish State it was the king. In the time when the Jews were conquered by the Romans the head of this Sanhedrin was actually the Roman procurator, through his administrator, the high priest. Before this Sanhedrin Jesus was brought and tried. Therefore in fact Jesus was tried by the Romans and executed by the Romans. Neither the Jewish religious Sanhedrin nor the Jewish people had anything at all to do with

the trial and the crucifixion of Jesus. I first published this conclusion in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* and later I brought it out in a popular form in my book *Who Crucified Jesus?* Msgr. Newton reviewed my book in the April issue of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly.*

The crucifixion of Jesus has a theological aspect. The Gospels not only relate the events in connection with Jesus's crucifixion, they also convey the theological conception of Jesus. They interpret passages in the ancient Hebrew prophets to prove that Jesus is the Messiah—Christ, destined to be crucified and resurrected, as prophetically foretold. The assertion that the Jews crucified Jesus is well indicated by the Gospel according to John. The Church Fathers openly accused the Jews as the guilty ones who crucified Jesus. One of the great Popes of the Middle Ages, Innocent III, in his policy towards the Jews, always had in mind the guilt of the Jews because "they crucified the Lord." And throughout the ages the Jews have been called "Christ killers" occasionally.

However, the crucifixion of Jesus has also a historical aspect. As a matter of historical fact certain questions arise: If the Jews were guilty of the crucifixion, what crime had Jesus committed against the Jews that they should crucify Him? The Gospels tell us that a Sanhedrin was summoned the night of his arrest, and Jesus was condemned and brought before the procurator Pilate. The Gospels further relate that Pilate was even ready to dismiss Jesus, but the Jews demanded his death.

Msgr. Newton took exception to my scholarly handling of the Gospel sources. The reviewer maintained that in dealing with the Sanhedrin I relied on tannaitic sources, which, in his opinion, are both "late" and "unreliable," since it has no support in the New Testament and by Josephus. As to their being "late," my sources were the statements of Tannaim, who lived in the first half of the second century. This cannot be considered late. As to their being "unreliable," because they are not supported by the New Testament and Josephus, this judgment is not correct in my opinion. I made it clear that the Talmud speaks of a religious Sanhedrin while the New Testament and Josephus deal with a political Sanhedrin. The Talmud speaks of a Sanhedrin which held sessions every day in its own court house. The New Testament and Josephus speak of a Sanhedrin which had to be summoned for special purposes at the request or command of the ruler or his appointee. Because there were two different Sanhedrins there is no contradiction.

The Talmudic statement that the Sanhedrin did not hold court on Sabbath and on the holydays is corroborated by Josephus. From Josephus (Ant. 16, 6, 2.) we learn that Augustus Caesar wrote to the Praetor that the Jews should not be compelled to appear for trial before a judge on the Sabbath or on the Day of Preparation, Friday, after

the ninth hour. From this it is clearly evident that as far back as the time of Augustus Caesar the Jews were excused from appearing before a Roman court on the Sabbath and on the eve of the Sabbath after the ninth hour (three o'clock P. M.). Assuredly the Jews themselves would not require that their own Sanhedrin try a man for a capital offense on a Sabbath or a holy day, or on the eve of those days.

Msgr. Newton's statement that "Mishna Sanhedrin makes full provision for both courts" is not correct. The Mishna Sanhedrin speaks only of the religious Sanhedrin. Msgr. Newton claims that in my book I reject "several terms and expressions that might injure his (Zeitlin's) position on the mere plea that they are wanting in some manuscripts." On page 102 in my book I said, "It is well known that the various manuscripts of the New Testament have different readings. While some readings may be due to inadvertant errors of the scribes, we cannot overlook that some readings reach back to an early period before the Gospels were actually put into writing." It goes without saying that the Jews never had occasion to deal with the New Testament manuscripts. The copying of the manuscripts was done by very religious Christians.

Let us examine the sentence in Mark 10:33, "Behold we go up to Jerusalem, and the Son of man shall be betrayed to the chief priests and to the scribes and ancients. And they shall condemn him to death and shall deliver him to the Gentiles." In some manuscripts the word death *θανάτῳ*, is omitted (comp. Von Soden, *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, II. *Text mit Apparat*, p. 186). Such an omission can not be ascribed merely to a scribal error. The Church in the Middle Ages taught that Jesus was put to death by the Jews, therefore it is certainly reliable scholarship to assume that the copyists had a manuscript which went back to a period before the Gospels were actually put into writing. The reviewer claims if one looks up these texts in Nestle (10th ed.) "he will find that in not one of them is the evidence against the reading sufficient even to be listed." Now, Nestle's edition is merely a pocket edition of the main works. Why should a scholar go to a pocket edition of Nestle instead of the full editions of Tischendorf and Von Soden? If one wishes to verify my references he can find them in Von Soden.

Let us now examine each of Msgr. Newton's objections to my omitting some words in the New Testament. First, to the word "hypocrite" (Mark 7:6; Luke 13:15). If one looks in Von Soden, one would find that different manuscripts omit the word Hypocrite from these two Gospels. Second, in the story of the betrayal of Judas, as given in Matthew, the word *rabbi* is mentioned, while in Luke (22:47) the word *rabbi* is missing, "As he was yet speaking, behold a multitude; and he that was called Judas, one of the twelve, went before them and drew near to Jesus, for to kiss him." In my essay on the

Pharisees and the Gospels I endeavored to show that the word *rabbi* as a technical name was not known to the Jews until after the destruction of the second Temple. The scholars used their own names but never affixed the title *rabbi.* As a matter of fact, Jesus was usually addressed as Teacher διδάσκαλε. Even when the Pharisees (Matt. 22:35-36; Mark, 12:14,32; Luke, 20:21,39) and the scholars of the law approached him they called him *Teacher,* and not *rabbi.* We would expect from the Pharisees and the scholars of the law, when they asked Jesus questions on the law, that they should address him as *rabbi* if such title was already in use. Thirdly, as to the omission of the word *death,* from Mark 10:33, I have already remarked on this above. If the copyist actually had the word *death* in his manuscript, he would never have omitted it.

Msgr. Newton took exception to my strictures on the story of Pilate's washing his hands. Washing the hands as a symbol of innocence was not known to the Romans. It was practiced among the ancient Jews. It is indeed unbelievable that Pilate, whom Philo describes as a most cruel person, a man who murdered even innocent people without any trial, suddenly became a man of scruples and of conscience, washing his hands as a sign of his innocence. Also, we have to bear in mind that Luke speaks with condemnation of the atrocities that Pilate committed. Therefore, from the historical point of view, I was quite right to suggest that the washing of the hands could not have been in the original Gospel. It is of special interest to record that the other Gospels do not mention the incident.

Msgr. Newton claims that all agree that "John uses the word (Jews) almost exclusively of the leaders of Judaism." Msgr. Newton's assertion is not borne out by the Gospel itself. The word *Jews* is recorded in John over sixty times, while in the Synoptic Gospels the word *Jews* appears only a few times and then only in connection with the trial of Jesus, or when used by Gentiles, and at the trial of Jesus because Pilate participated. How could the reviewer explain the peculiar use of the word "Jewish" in such expression as *Jewish Passover* or the *Jewish Feast of Tabernacles*—were these festivals observed only by the leaders and not by the people themselves? There is no question that the term *Jews* in John refers to the Jews, and not to the leaders of the Jews. As a matter of fact, John differentiates between the Jews and the leaders of the Jews. In 3:1 when he speaks about Nicodemus. he calls him ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων, a ruler of the Jews. In 7:48 he also mentions the rulers of the Jews, "Had any one of the rulers believed in him or of the Pharisees." Thus, John does differentiate between leaders and the people.

My statement that John does not mention any *halakic* (legal) disputes betwen the Jews and the Pharisees, is correct. In Chapter 7:31 John states, "But of the people many believed in him, and said when

the Christ cometh, shall he do more miracles than this man doth?" The objection of the Pharisees was that the people and the rulers believed in his miracles. "The Pharisees heard the people murmuring these things concerning him, and the rulers and the Pharisees sent ministers to apprehend him." In Chapter 9:11-16, likewise, the Pharisees claimed that Jesus is not a man of God. "That man that is called Jesus made clay and anointed my eyes and said to me: Go to the pool of Siloe and wash. And I went: I washed and I see.... Now it was the sabbath, when Jesus made the clay and opened his eyes. Again therefore the Pharisees asked him how he had received his sight. But he said to them: He put clay upon my eyes: and I washed: and I see. Some therefore of the Pharisees said: This man is not of God, who keepeth not the sabbath. But others said: How can a man that is a sinner do such miracles?" In the Synoptic Gospels we are told of the contention between Jesus and the Pharisees on purely *halakic* matters, and not about miracles.

Msgr. Newton asks forthrightly what motive I had in writing this book. He writes, "In fact, one might well ask why Dr. Zeitlin should take up this question at all. He is learned enough to know that the Jews have no need of its solution, that its answer by a Jew will hardly satisfy the true Christian, and that one who belongs to neither class will not be interested in it." As I stated previously, I was interested in the historical fact— who crucified Jesus? and not in the theological aspect of Jesus, hence I had in mind both Jews and true Christians, and I hoped that anyone who belongs to either faith would be interested to know the historical fact—that neither the Synoptic Gospels nor the Apostolic Fathers ever accused the Jews of Jesus' crucifixion. It is true that the Gospel, according to John, lays the blame for the crucifixion upon the Jews. We must not forget, however, that the general opinion of the New Testament scholars is that the Fourth Gospel was written some time in the second century. In the article on the Fourth Gospel in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* the following is stated: "The historical genuineness of the Fourth Gospel is at the present time almost universally denied outside the Catholic Church." In the same article it is said that A. Loisy (one of the greatest authorities on the New Testament, himself a Catholic) has also reached the point where he openly denies the historicity of the Fourth Gospel.

Msgr. Newton continues, "He should also know that the true Christian cannot persecute the Jews, even though he believes they put Christ to death." I entirely agree with Msgr. Newton that the true Christian should not persecute the Jews since Christianity is indeed based on the Hebrew Bible and the teachings of the Hebrew prophets. In the long history of Jewish persecutions we know that many Popes protected the Jews from rulers and tyrants who tortured and expelled them from their lands and robbed them of their possessions.

The present Pope, Pius XII, with his great humanitarian spirit has, from time to time, where his voice could be heard, interceded for the Jews. However, to our great regret, many Christians are guilty of the act of persecuting the Jews. In many of their school text-books the children are instructed that the Jews crucified Jesus and therefore justly suffer hatred and persecution. I wish that Msgr. Newton were right!

Msgr. Newton asserts that the Jews were persecuted by the Romans before the rise of Christianity, and now in Nazi Germany by Hitler who is not regarded as a Christian. It is true that the Jews of the Diaspora suffered very much before the advent of Christianity. But why? The reason for anti-Jewishness in the Greco-Roman period was due to the fact that the people were polytheists,—that is they worshiped many gods. Besides worshiping the god of the city where they dwelt, they also worshiped the god of the conqueror. The stranger who came to dwell in a new city worshiped both his own god and the god in the city where he sojourned. The Jews, on the other hand, were the only monotheists at that time; they worshiped only one God, the God of the Universe. When a Jew left Palestine for another country and dwelt in a strange city he would not worship the god of the new city. The offended pagans accused him of not being loyal to his new city and also of being an atheist. The Jews, with their uncompromising attitude towards the pagan world, incurred the constant hostility of the people of Asia Minor. However, this stubbornness of the Jews concerning the one God and the belief that He is the God of the Universe made it possible for Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, to preach his Gospel. The Jews paved the ground for Christianity so that it could gain recruits among the pagan world. Thus the Jews of the Diaspora, who shed their blood upholding the idea of the universal God, helped to spread Christianity throughout that pagan world. We may truly say that the blood of the Jews was the seed of the Church.

The persecution of the Jews in Nazi Germany by Hitler is due, among other reasons, to the fact that the Jews gave Jesus to the world. Hitler, with his "intuition," knows, as his forefathers—the pagans of the ancient world knew, that in order to destroy Christianity—Catholicism and Protestantism—he must first annihilate the Jews and Judaism. Titus (subsequently the Roman Emperor) who set fire to the Temple of Jerusalem was aware of this same fact, namely that Christianity is an offshoot of Judaism. Tacitus, the Roman historian, records that Titus said "Christianos ex Judaeis extitisse: radice sublata stirpem facile perituram," "The Christians had grown out of the Jews: if the root were destroyed, the stalk would easily perish."

Msgr. Newton maintains that my book *Who Crucified Jesus* is modern Israel's cry of "not guilty." If there is any cry coming out of

this book it comes not from Israel but from me, a student of rabbinics and ancient history. But, if the book could be held to make a charge, that charge would refer to the "cry of guilt" to the Christian world for using the crucifixion of Jesus as a pretext for enslaving and persecuting the Jews throughout the ages. Modern Christians should recognize that the charge is a libel against a whole innocent people.

Religion, Jewish and Christian, can develop freely in this country where a man may worship his God after the dictates of his own heart. In a time when the old paganism of Rome lives again under a different guise, and where the cruelties of Caligula and Nero are again visited upon suffering humans by modern pagans, a better mutual understanding and appreciation between Christians and Jews is indispensable for the realization of the ideas and ideals which came forth from the hills of Judea.

SOLOMON ZEITLIN

Dropsie College, Philadelphia

BIBLICAL NEWS

The Rev. John J. Collins, S.J. of Weston College, chairman of the committee for the commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus,* with the aid of the other committee members, Rev. John G. Hanley of Kingston, Ontario, Rev. Charles Heupler, O.F.M.Cap., and Rev. Elmer McNamara, has succeeded in having articles pertinent to the anniversary appear in many of the leading Catholic periodicals. Articles have been carried by *America, The Homiletic and Pastoral Review, The Ecclesiastical Review, The Sign, The Catholic University Bulletin,* and other well known publications.

The Committee also arranged numerous radio broadcasts. The TRANS-CANADA network carried addresses on five successive Sundays, beginning November 7, 1943. The speakers were the Very Rev. President of the Catholic Biblical Association, Donat Poulet, O.M.I., the Rev. Richard J. Dobell of St. Augustine Seminary, Toronto, the Rev. L. J. Flynn of St. Peter's Seminary, London, the Rev. C. F. DeVine, C.Ss.R. of St. Alphonsus Seminary, Woodstock, and the Rev. J. G. Hanley, Associate Editor of the Register, Kingston. Station WEW, St. Louis, Mo. carried a series of four addresses by the Rev. Ed. L. Murphy, S.J. on the four Sundays of November. These addresses were later re-broadcast by transcription over ten other stations in various parts of the country. MUTUAL'S RADIO CHAPEL on Sunday, November 21, broadcast over its network an address by the Rev. G. H. Guyot, C.M., Kenrick Seminary, St. Louis, Mo. THE YANKEE NETWORK OF NEW ENGLAND carried two addresses by the Rev. James E. Coleran, S.J., Weston College, Weston, Mass. on

November 28 and Dec. 5. An effort to get the CATHOLIC HOUR to broadcast addresses relative to the Encyclical's anniversary failed, through no fault of the committee.

Under the direction of the resourceful and energetic president of the Catholic Biblical Association, Very Rev. Donat Poulet, O.M.I., a most impressive commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of *Providentissimus Deus* was held at the University Seminary, Ottawa. On Thursday, November 18, a solemn pontifical Mass was celebrated in the Seminary chapel by an Oblate Bishop. Illness prevented His Excellency, the Archbishop of Ottawa from attending. In the afternoon at 3:30 there was a solemn reunion, presided over by His Excellency, the Most Reverend Ildebrando Antoniutti, Apostolic Delegate to Canada. The session was opened by Father Poulet with a short address in French explaining the purpose of the celebration. Then Monsignor William L. Newton of Cleveland, Ohio, gave an address in English, in which he treated of the circumstances which called forth the encyclical, then reviewed the progress made since 1893 in biblical studies, and finally pointed out what yet remains to be accomplished. The meeting was closed by an address of His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate, who spoke in Latin. The day was closed with solemn benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, at which the Apostolic Delegate was celebrant.

Monsignor Newton also gave two other conferences at Ottawa to the three hundred and more seminarians: one on the new English Version of the Bible and one on the Covenant in the Old Testament.

During the past year the Association has distributed almost twenty thousand copies of the *Providentissimus Deus* to the clergy, the religious, and the laity in all parts of the country.

The work of revising the Association's *Commentary on the New Testament* is progressing satisfactorily. This important task is being handled by the Rev. M. P. Stapleton, S.T.D., S.S.L., assisted by the Rev. John E. Steinmueller, S.T.D., S.S.L. and the Rev. Louis Hartman, C.Ss.R., S.S.L.

Septuagesima Sunday, which has been chosen as permanent Biblical Sunday, this year falls on Feb. 6. Plans are being formulated for the proper celebration of this important Sunday.

The work of revising the English of the Old Testament is advancing steadily. The final draft of the twelve Minor Prophets is all but finished, and the Psalms are in the final stages of preparation. Publication of the Psalms and the Minor Prophets, unless unforeseen difficulties arise, may be counted on before the end of the year 1944.

A general meeting of the Association is tentatively planned for next August. The place, if the meeting is held, will be the centrally located and ideally equipped St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

OLD TESTAMENT AND RELATED SUBJECTS

Rev. Patrick W. Skehan, S.T.D.
Rev. John P. Weisengoff, S.T.D., S.S.L.

Biblical Archaeologist, 6, 1943. G. E. W(right), "I Samuel 13:19-21" (33-36). A summary of recent discussion on the tools and monetary values named in these verses.

J. Penrose Harland, "Sodom and Gomorrah II: the Destruction of the Cities of the Plain" (41-4). Biblical, classical, and ancient Jewish testimonies are combined to suggest that "a great earthquake, perhaps accompanied by lightning, brought utter ruin and a terrible conflagration.... The destructive fire may have been caused by the ignition of gases and of seepages of asphalt...." This summary is based in large measure upon a study by F. G. Clapp in the *Bulletin of the American Association of Petroleum Geologists,* Vol. 20, 1936. The dust-filled fruits of the region are also discussed, as is the possibility of future opening-up of petroleum deposits nearby.

H. G. May, "The Ten Lost Tribes" (55-60). An antidote, for those who need it, for the pseudo-mystical effort to correlate the northern tribes of Irsael with known people of a later day—most often in our time with the Anglo-Saxons.

Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 90, 1943. Nelson Glueck, "Three Israelite Towns in the Jordan Valley: Zarethan, Succoth, Zaphon" (2-23). Presents the writer's conclusions on the character of the settlements in the northern part of the Jordan valley on its eastern side during the Early Iron (Hebrew) period. Stresses the evidence from his personal explorations for a considerable settled population (thirty inhabited sites) in that place and period, as against generalizations which make the whole Jordan valley a jumbled wilderness. Confirms the identification of Adamah (Jos. 3:16 etc.) with Tell- ed- Dâmiyeh, and then offers detailed discussion of sites proposed for the three towns named above, which with Adamah and Jabesh Gilead are given to us by the O.T. as located in this freshly studied region. See also Floyd V. Filson, in *BASOR,* 91, 1943, 27-8, for an objection to the proposed site of Zaphon.

G. Levi della Vida, "Some Notes on the Stele of Ben-Hadad" (30-34). Suggests that the stele commemorates a treaty-arrangement, possibly involving a royal marriage, between Ben-Hadad of Damascus and Ittobaal of Tyre, such as that which made Jezebel queen of Israel. Further discussion by Albright in an appendix deals with the rendering and other implications of the stele (for which cf. *BASOR,* 87, 1942).

G. R. Driver, "Notes on Some Recently Recovered Proper Names" (34). The names are from sherds or ostraca recently published, and new readings are here proposed.

W. F. Albright, "The Copper Spatula from Byblos and Proverbs 1:18" (35-37). Five short lines of Phoenician text, on an object first published by Dunand, are presented as commemorative of the settlement by lot of a legal dispute. The inscribed object (now dated as perhaps eleventh century B.C.) may have been used in the actual casting of the lots.

W. F. Albright, "Books Received by the Editor" (39-42; continued in *no.* 91, 44-47). A handy guide to current literature on biblical and related topics.

Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research, 91, 1943. "The Informal Archaeological Conference in Jerusalem, July 10-11, 1943" (2-7). Report of an "unofficial scholarly conference" of archeologists of various nationalities, to discuss the future of Near Eastern archeology after the war. A permanent council of international character is planned, and a series of resolutions looking to the effective progress of archeological work is listed in this report. The points covered include suitable conditions for governmental licensing of excavations, plans for an international clearing-house of archeological information, standards for training field-workers and similar matters.

Nelson Glueck, "Some Ancient Towns in the Plains of Moab" (7-26). Carries the report of Glueck's surface exploration over a territory to the south of that previously described by him (cf. above) in his survey of the east side of the Jordan valley. Besides several identifications of biblical sites, an ingenious irrigation system, developed apparently in Persian times, is described, and the age of Transjordan dolmens (before 4000 B.C.?) is re-examined.

W. F. Albright, "The Furniture of El in Canaanite Mythology" (39-44). Fourteen quite difficult lines of the Baal text from Ugarit, re-interpreted.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, 27, 1942. Samuel Krauss, "Two Hitherto Unknown Bible Versions in Greek" (97-105). A discussion based on several rabbinical texts which suggest to the writer of the article that "Ben Tilga" and "Ben La'ana" were responsible for renderings into Greek of the O.T. Compare the utterly contrary and equally tenuous treatment of the same material by Harris Hirschberg in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 62, 1943, 73-87, "Allusions to the Apostle Paul in the Talmud," where Paul is Simon Magus who is Ben Tilga or Ben La'ana!

Erwin I. J. Rosenthal, "Saadja Gaon: an Appreciation of his Biblical Exegesis" (168-178). A rather general sketch, in view of the

millenary anniversary of Saadja's death; a good index to Saadja's thought by one having first-hand acquaintance with it.

Henry Guppy, "Human Records: a Survey of their History from the Beginning" (182-221). A librarian of forty years' tenure in the important John Rylands Library outlines the history of writing materials and writing in ancient times in a popular sketch, of interest to the student of the Bible.

Edward Robertson, "The Riddle of the Torah: Suggesting a Solution" (359-383). Adopts the traditional Jewish terminology of a written and an oral law to propose that "the Written Law in its earlier stages grew by the slow and intermittent absorption of midrashic elements from the Oral Law." Makes the Ten Commandments the core of a midrashic development which is the Book of the Covenant; the whole Pentateuch is a series of haggadic and halakhic accretions to a primitive nucleus.

Church Quarterly Review, 136, 1943. F. C. Synge, "Prophecy and 'prenouncement'" (36-58). "Prenouncement" is an unconditional prediction based on foreknowledge; it is an activity, uncanny, supernatural, as unlike as may be to the correct answer to a chemist's formula. The prophets can be "prenouncers" only if they called the people to repentance in face of ineluctable doom, not to offer them a way of escape from it. The "salvationist" elements are late.

Expository Times, 54, 1942-3. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., "A New Interpretation of Ps. cxxvii, 2b" (223). Another attempt at an explanation. Cf. *ibid.*, 25-6.

T. H. Robinson, "Hebrew Metre and Old Testament Exegesis" (246-8). The metrical form supplies a factor in exegesis which cannot safely be overlooked.

C. E. B. Cranfield, "An Interpretation of the Book of Job" (295-8). Before the Book of Job was written, there was current a folk-story about a patriarch Job, for the most part the same as the story in the Book. The final restoration of Job is the really significant feature of the Book. "In the saga Job had been vindicated for the sake of his own righteousness; in our book it is the penitent Job who is restored, not for the sake of his own merit but out of free grace."

Expository Times, 55, 1943-4. H. H. Rowley, "The 'Prince of the Covenant' in Daniel XI, 22" (24-7). "The Prince of the Covenant" should be rendered "rightful prince," who would be Antiochus, the young son of Seleucus Philopator. This supposes an Aramaic substratum.

Jewish Quarterly Review, 34, 1943-4. A. S. Halkin, "The Scholia to Numbers and Deuteronomy in the Samaritan-Arabic Pentateuch" (41-59). Revives the questions of authorship and date of the Samaritan-Arabic rendering of the Pentateuch, variously decided by scholars

on the basis of divergent ascriptions and recensions in the manuscripts.

Journal of the American Oriental Society, 63, 1943. Theophile J. Meek, "The Challenge of Oriental Studies to American Scholarship" (83-93). The 'demonstration' by the late Stephen Langdon of primitive monotheism in Mesopotamia comes in for renewed examination (p. 85) which should keep responsible scholars from using it. On p. 87 occurs this interesting remark: "For the preparation of *The Old Testament: an American Translation* (Chicago, 1927) the translators were allowed only three short years."

Robert Gordis, "The Asseverative Kaph in Ugaritic and Hebrew" (176-178). Proposes that not only *kī* but also *k-* as a proclitic in Hebrew can have an asseverative force; the latter being so used generally before substantives at the end of a clause. Argues from the absence of a word-divider after parallel uses in Ugaritic that *k-* and not *kī* is the form intended for the purpose in that dialect.

S. N. Kramer, "Man's Golden Age: A Sumerian Parallel to Gen. XI, 1" (191-194). Fourteen lines of a tablet from Nippur which seem to suggest a Sumerian concept of a primitive period, for mankind as a whole, of unity of language and security from harm.

Journal of Biblical Literature, 62, 1943. Frank R. Blake, "The Origin and Development of the Hebrew Daghesh" (89-107). The Syriac supralinear dot for strong pronunciation and supralinear line for an omission (of vowel or consonant) are the basis of the *daghesh* and *raphē*. The subsequent use of the daghesh is carefully and clearly outlined, with the prudent addition "In some few cases the point (apparently daghesh) seems to be independent of the development here sketched."

H. L. Ginsberg, "The Ugaritic Texts and Textual Criticism" (109-115). A statement of the text-critical results obtained thus far by comparing the Hebrew biblical text with recently found Ugaritic material:—the passages affected are 2 Sam. 1:21; Is. 51:17,22; Jer. 9:20; Job 28:11; 37:3; Ps. 68:5.

Ralph Marcus, "The Tree of Life in Proverbs" (117-120). Understands the meaning as essentially "health-giving medicine" in Proverbs, whatever be the Mesopotamian mythological background of the term for the later writings which elaborate on the expression in Genesis.

G. R. Driver, "Habbakuk 3,7": further reconstruction of this verse on the basis of a newly recognized root occurring in the material from Ugarit. Cpr. Albright, *BASOR*, 82, 48-9, who made the essential identification of the root חתא in the verse.

Alexander Sperber, "Hebrew Grammar: a New Approach" (137-262). Points of interest: a list of verb-roots which can be used in-

differently in either of two conjugations in an identical meaning; denial that the vocalization of the inseparable prepositions with an *'a'* vowel represents the presence of the article; assertion that the negatives אַל and לֹא may be used indiscriminately; tendency to read *qames* in a closed syllable frequently as *'a,'* not *'o'*; the assumption that *waw* and *yod* as 'matres lectionis' were gradually *withdrawn* from the biblical text after the invention of the vowel points; supposition that *aleph* was used in the interior of words as 'mater lectionis' for an *'a'* vowel, where the consonantal etymology is not involved. "The vocalization of the *waw* with verbal forms with *sheva* or *a* shows no regard for the difference in the tenses, whether perfect or imperfect, and is equally indifferent to the function which the grammar ascribes . . ." Cases of apparently interchangeable use of the tenses are listed; then, "The difference that existed between the suffix tense and the prefix tense was not of a temporal, but rather of a dialectic character." All cases of *Pe Nun* verbs with an assimilated *nun* come from parallel biconsonantal roots; *aleph* and *he* at the end of verb roots are habitually interchangeable. More of the same sort is included. The one good point is a criticism of the tendency to substitute עַל for אַל and vice versa in the text on the basis of a supposed clear-cut distinction in meaning.

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 2, 1943. W. E. Staples, "The 'Vanity' of Ecclesiastes" (95-104). Attempt at a renewed interpretation of the term *hebel.*

Roland G. Kent, "Old Persian Texts III: Darius' Behistan Inscription, Column V" (105-114). A new collation of this last column of the famous record.

George G. Cameron, "A Photograph of the Darius Sculpture at Behistan" (115-6, Plate II). A composite of two photographs, giving an excellent impression of the entire sweep of the cutting in the rock surface, with its scene in relief and its columns of text.

H. Frankfort, Seton Lloyd, Fuad Safar, "Tell Uqair: Excavations by the Iraq Government Directorate of Antiquities in 1940 and 1941" (131-158, 29 plates). The settlement is of proto-historic periods preceding that of the known Mesopotamian dynasties; discoveries include some early tablets, a temple-structure with wall-frescoes, novelties of design in clay models and in pottery decoration.

Thorkild Jacobsen, "Primitive Democracy in Ancient Mesopotamia" (159-172). Place of the popular assembly in the lives of gods and men, especially according to Babylonian literature. Possible O.T. parallels are not treated.

D. R. Ap-Thomas, "A Numerical Poser" (198-200). Takes the figures given for David's spoils in the Syrian campaign, 2 Sam. 8:4; 10:18; 1 Para. 18:4; 18:18 and harmonizes them on the basis of an

underlying 1000 chariots, 700 horsemen, and 20,000 footmen as the source of the current divergent readings in MT, LXX, and Josephus.

Journal of Religion, 23, 1943. Mary E. Andrews, "Hesiod and Amos" (194-205). "Both describe a contemporary culture; both represent the inarticulate masses; both are men from the country." A comparison as well as a contrast between the two.

Journal of Theological Studies, 44, 1943. "Notes on the Psalms, II: 73-150" (12-23). A valuable series of concisely presented notes "largely the result of a re-examination of the text of the psalms for lexicographical purposes." These should be seen; they cannot be summarized. A worthwhile historical note is the author's statement: "In the course of this work I have made the interesting discovery that many of those emendations—in fact 356 of them—which are usually ascribed to German scholars of the last century go back to one French scholar (Houbigant, 100) and seven English scholars (Hare, 129 ....) of the two preceding centuries."

Alfred Guillaume, "A Note on the verb עשׂה" (23-4). Against Brown-Driver-Briggs, the root *is* represented in Arabic; an instance paralleling Lev. 4:2 is cited.

Palestine Exploration Quarterly, 75, 1943. M. E. Kirk, "An Outline of the Cultural History of Palestine Down to Roman Times" (9-49). The systematic and scientific excavations of numerous Palestinian cities have thrown great light upon the life of ancient Palestine, so that "the shape of the past is now distinctly discernible." Three quarters of the article are devoted to pre-Israelitic Palestine.

David Diringer, "The Dating of Early Hebrew Inscriptions" (50-54); "Note on Some Jar-Stamps and Seals Discovered at Lachish" (55-6). Discussion based on previous articles in *P.E.Q.* and in *BASOR* of the date and readings of various epigraphic finds in Palestine. Diringer with his customary caution emphasizes the paucity of material for an adequate absolute or relative chronology of early Semitic alphabetic writing.

Review of Religion, 7, 1943. Eric Werner, "Notes on the Attitude of the Fathers Towards Hebrew Psalmody" (339-352). In general the Early Church showed a preference for the simple Hebrew psalm music rather than for songs with embellishments. A very interesting article.

Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira, 3, 1943. D. João Mehlmann, "A Criacão de Adão e o Transformismo" (352-370). Arguments against the view of the immediate creation of Adam's body by God are insufficient. On the contrary we have such strong theological reasons for it, that it becomes most probable.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

BOOK REVIEWS

EDWARD J. KISSANE, D.D., L.S.S. *The Book of Isaiah.* Vol. I, Chapters I–XXXIX. (Dublin: Browne and Nolan, Ltd., 1941). Pp. lxiv, 425. 21s.

This volume is in some respects a worthy accession to the English literature of biblical science. In method it is thorough and orderly; in expression it is uniformly clear, definite, and restrained. The exegesis is based on independent reasons, and is self-consistent on the whole. The author's attitude is that of well balanced criticism, properly conscious of historical occasion, while wary of subjective bias in its discernment and application. Students of Isaias should find his work suggestive.

While many features merit notice in detail, our space must limit us to a few conspicuous characteristics. To begin with externals, the paper and print are excellent and the arrangement attractive. Compositors' errors are almost or quite unknown. As for errata of another class, a reference to the Cambridge Modern History on p. xii should, of course, be to the Cambridge Ancient History; and the spelling "Appolonia" (xiv, 111) is an oversight. Hebrew proper names imitate the Authorized Version of Anglicans, except as they occur in references to other books, where they conform to Challoner. The reason for this inconsistency is not evident.

The Introduction comprises eight sections and a map. All is clearly and adequately done without useless detail, especially that on the vexed question of the chronology of the period, where, incidentally, Göttsberger's work might have been included among references. Of the text itself each literary division is preceded by its own historical introduction, then presented in a metrical version of the Hebrew, and followed by a detailed commentary, the first and third of these elements being in finer print. The translation is also followed by a few lines of suggested textual corrections.

Especially important to the whole scope are the introductory sections on "authorship and composition" and on "metrical structure." In the first of these Dr. Kissane takes issue with the theory of combined fragments upheld by Duhm, Procksch, Gray, Kennett, and others, defending on historical and literary grounds the presumption that any integral passage should be accepted as Isaian until really proved otherwise. Examining the norms—political allusions, language and style, quality of ideas—to which divisive critics appeal for evidence, Dr. Kissane points out the limitations of their objective value, and further confirms the original unity of the collection from his conclusions about its literary structure as a whole. The discussion equips a reader with a sound and reasonable orientation.

In his section on metrical structure Dr. Kissane recognizes the verse (distich or tristich) as the ultimate unit of Old Testament poetry, and the strophe as what we may call its adequate unit. Of the verse he writes: "The poet allows himself the utmost freedom both as regards the length of the stichos or line, the number of lines [i.e. two or three] in each verse, and the number of verses in each strophe.... It is therefore a mistake to try by textual emendation to produce a uniform system of metre throughout a poem" (xlix-l). Further, as the strophe (when not marked by some literary device) is best determined by unity of theme, so the larger composition, or "poem," is defined by its unity and isolation in the whole collection. As to this,

> The strophic system adopted in the present work... is based on two fundamental principles: a) the verse, whether couplet or triplet, is the unit of metre and of thought, and b) the strophe consists of the group of verses which develop the same thought... The rigid application of the two principles mentioned gives the following remarkable results:—
>
> 1. The verses are joined together in groups (strophes) which vary in length from two to eight verses. 2. Each poem has a *regular strophic system* which is maintained throughout. 3. The strophic system employed is that of *strophes of equal length* (i.e. equal number of verses), with the exception of Chapter xxxiii, in which the strophes are "odd and even," i.e. of two and three verses, alternately (liv-lv: italics original).

The last two rules cannot but have their part in interpretation. Each poem—each occasional oracle, discourse, or sermon—is said to consist of strophes having the same number of verses. This plan is declared invariable. We believe, of course, that obvious unity of subject is the first criterion of the strophe's extent. It is not always a perspicuous one, since sequence or transition may sometimes escape us by a verse or two. We are dealing with sermons delivered in pre-exilic Hebrew, and may miss the connective or disjunctive force of some idiom. But where continuity or change of theme is too clear to be overlooked, it should govern structural division above all other norms. Dr. Kissane also seems to be quite of this mind; but his further "discovery" that each poem employs none but uniform strophes must stand the proof of testing.

To go no further than space permits, we may trace his rendering of the first five chapters of Isaias, forming the first section of the book. He divides it into eight poems, of which only three—the fourth (2:22–3:15), the fifth (3:16–4:6) and the sixth (5:1-7)—can meet his rule without textual rearrangement. The other five require transposition, omission or addition of whole lines to make them conform. The strophic norm is not expressly invoked to justify such corrections, but their necessity to it is plain in every case, while the independent reasons advanced for them are at least no stronger than others to the contrary.

In Poem 1 (1:1-20) verse 13a-b is inserted between 11 and 12, completing here an eight-couplet strophe and leaving one in the place

whence it is removed. The transferred couplet, we are told, "deals with sacrifices and not with festivals; it interrupts the sentence begun in 12c and continued in 13c [but is this one sentence?]; 'to trample my courts' is parallel to 'to call assemblies'" (p. 11). If festivals and sacrifices should really be kept apart in such a setting, it may be replied that to leave 13a-b where it is elaborates the arrangement by a minor transition twice repeated in the same order: sacrifices (11), festivals (12), sacrifices (13a-b), festivals 13c-14). Such devices are not uncommon. In Poem 2 (1:21-31) verse 25 is thus presented:

> And I will turn my hand against thee,
> . . . . . .
> And I will purge away thy dross as in the furnace,
> And take away all thy base metal.

To postulate a lost line makes the strophe consist of six couplets, like its neighbors. We are merely told that "the parallel clause [to 25a] is missing" (p. 19). But no MS or version suggests an omission, and there is no evident loss of sequence in reading the lines as a tristich. In Poem 3 (2:1-21) the whole of verse 19, comprising a distich and a tristich, is stated (again without objective evidence) to be "probably a later addition based on 10 and 21" (p. 32). Certainly no inept addition, in view of what immediately follows it; but where it stands, it wrecks the author's strophic scheme. Poem 4 (2:22–3:15) presents an exception in that its only transposition would leave the strophe unaffected. The reasons for and against it are of the same class as in 1:13a-b. In Poems 5 and 6 no rearrangements are proposed. In Poem 7 (5:8-17) verses 15-17 are so attached to 10 as to extend it into a strophe of the required length. Some critics regard the whole passage as a later addition, while others place parts of it in other connections. "But," concludes the author, "it is probable that the whole verse originally stood after verse 10" (p. 59). For this he gives four contextual reasons based on the thought involved in 10, all plainly matters of individual judgment. Finally, in Poem 8 (5:18-30) the whole of 8:21-22 is introduced to follow 5:30, where it completes a defective strophe and supplies another entire. This is justified on the following grounds:

> In their present position [in chapter 8], these verses are a fragment which has no connection with the immediate context. Their resemblance to v. 30 has been remarked by several critics; but Condamin was the first to propose the view that both originally formed part of the same poem. But instead of transferring v. 26-30 as he does, it is more natural to transfer viii. 21-22, which is admittedly [!] an isolated fragment, and place it after v. 30, where it not only serves to complete the poem but continues the same strophic arrangement (p. 60).

The Hebrew of 8:10, with its closing note of "no dawn," is somewhat obscure; but if the reading be accepted, it gives 21-22 a striking connection with the immediate context.

Thus, in eight consecutive poems, six cases of transposition are based on reasons by no means cogent, and five of the six are indispensable to the "remarkable results" of Dr. Kissane's strophic system. We do not insinuate that the demands of the latter decided in any instance the question of textual rearrangement. It suffices to observe that, unless any one of the five transpositions is accepted as certain, the poem in which it occurs fails to conform to a norm declared to be invariable. Thus the norm itself fails to stand the test of scrutiny.

The apparatus criticus which follows each section of text will be found both helpful and suggestive. It takes account of what is most significant in standard sources, and most of the proposed emendations are justified by existing variants or actual obscurities, though a few seem to originate in the author's preferences. No one, naturally, would agree with them all, and the particular reasons for dissent would vary. It is proposed in 1:7 to alter *zārîm* to either *Sᵉdōm* or *zēdîm*. But any alternative cancels the only objective reason for any correction at all, which is the persistent association of the word *mahpēkāh* with the destruction of Sodom. In 1:20 Dr. Kissane (with Kittel) would correct unmodified *ḥereb* to *mēḥereb* with the support of a probable haplography. The general plausibility of such a syntax seems to commend it until one looks into the accepted use of the phrase proposed. In every case of *mēḥereb* (eight times) and *min-haḥereb* (twice) the preposition is strictly "from" after some such notion as "escape, deliver, remain." Idiom does not support its use in the meaning "by the sword." On the side of omission, in dealing with the always unmanageable *qārā'th* in 7:14, Dr. Kissane suggests no emendation even in vowels, writing (in his commentary), "The form is 3rd fem., the subject being 'virgin.' The Greek mistook this for the 2nd person." This is to neglect Zorell's highly probable proposal of *qorē'th*, which, besides affecting only the vowels, would group this third predicate of "virgin" with its predecessors, a similar participle and an adjective, and introduce no finite verb.

Among particulars of exegesis we meet with one surprise. The sublime prophecy in 9:6 (Hebrew, 9:5) is rendered as follows:

> For a child is born to us,
> A son is given to us,
> And authority is upon his shoulder;
> And his name is called:
> Wonder-counsellor, Divine-hero,
> Father for ever, Prince of peace.

Though a hyphen in "Divine-hero" is inexplicable, the literal meaning is explained as "god of a hero." For this departure from the uniform

consensus of Catholic exegetes (including Condamin, Feldmann, and Fischer) no serious reason is given. Metrical symmetry does not demand the rigor of a uniform syntax (construct and genitive) in all of the four pairs of words expressing the attributes of the Child. Nothing can reconcile it with Hebrew idiom—*pace* Dr. Briggs and his associates—so long as *'el* is nowhere in Hebrew literature a mere metaphor governing a genitive of genus, but in every textually certain case denotes a divine being, real or supposed. The plural in Ezech. 32:21, even were it not contested (*'eley* or *'eyley*), would be no pattern for a similar construction of the singular. The one clear parallel (which even Briggs does not try to manipulate) is "mighty God" in 10:21. Dr. Kissane does not hesitate to render this,

> A remnant shall return, a remnant of Jacob,
> To the divine-hero;

in spite of the fact that *'el gibbor* is plainly the same in person as "Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel" in the preceding verse. He explains: "The Messiah will be king of the new Sion, and only a remnant will be privileged to be his subjects" (p. 141). But as the whole prediction of the passage focuses upon Zion's deliverance from Sennacherib, it is hard to see to what "divine-hero" the remnant should return. Ezechias does not fill the rôle, nor does the angel of the pestilence.

If these two passages leave an unpleasant impression, this is happily not the case in most of Dr. Kissane's interpretations. In general they are influenced by his exegetical background and method of approach; and these are historical, as they should be. The charting of their main outlines is as nearly empirical as may be, and the consequent analysis appears in that part of the introduction which immediately follows the discussion of strophic structure. Dr. Kissane regards the Book of Isaias as a collection of the prophet's authentic oracles. All of them are separate poems, dating respectively from about 735 to 700 B.C. Some natural groups originating in a common occasion or situation may have become small collections within the prophet's lifetime; others were at length united with these in the whole collection. The function of uniting all in a continuous work required editorial titles and narrative sections; these adjuncts are in prose, and most of them supplied by the compiler. But a third element, also said to be in prose, comprises "additions" more properly such (of which more below). The finished work, the author believes, was compiled near the end of the Babylonian exile, with the contents of the book in their present order. "In the few instances in which the prophecies are dated, the compiler has contrived to arrange the prophecies so that these dates come in their regular order.... But there are many instances in which the chronological order has been violated" (p. xxxv).

This preview is sound and natural, supported by normal reasons, and well enough as a general plan. In detail, however, it sometimes raises as many questions as it settles. The uncertainty of internal allusions as historical signposts is illustrated by Dr. Kissane's disposal of the third class of passages, the simple "additions" to the positive matter of the book. These are eleven in number, namely, 10:12; 10:26; 11:11-12; 11:15-16; 14:3-4; 16:13-14; 18:7; 21:10; 22:24-25; 23:15-18, and, probably, 19:16-24. We would call attention to what is affirmed of these passages:

> All these passages are in prose; the prophecy is already complete without them, and in some cases (x. 12, 26, xi. 11-12) they interrupt the sequence of the poem. Three of these passages (xvi. 13-14, xxi. 10 and xxii. 24-25) are in the nature of comments on the prophecies which precede, and there is no reason for excluding the possibility that these comments were added by the prophet himself. The others are only loosely connected with the poems to which they are attached, and seem to be rather thoughts suggested by the prophecy which precedes, or an application of the prophecy to slightly different conditions. They reflect the conditions and aspirations of the people of the exilic period. The writer is concerned with the return of the *diaspora*, with the conversion of the gentiles, and with their homage to Sion. It is true that these ideas are to be found in Isaiah; but the manner in which they are expressed is somewhat different (pp. xxxiv-xxxv).

We venture to agree with Kittel that three of these passages (11:11-12; 11:15-16; 21:10) and parts of two others (22:24; 23:15-16) are written in poetic metre. This would again disturb Dr. Kissane's inviolable strophic scheme, besides taking these parts out of the hands of the later exilic compiler. But what impresses us in reading the lines just quoted is the assurance implied in pronouncing that in all of these contexts the prophecy—a message of the living God, the content and purport of which is known to us only from its record—is complete without the alleged addition; that seven such additions are only loosely connected with their preceding themes, and that three actually interrupt the poetic sequence. Of course, such phenomena are possible; but we need certainty of the concrete fact in every case. In particular it would be interesting to know what sequence is interrupted by 11:11-12, unless it be that of a predetermined literary structure. The theme passes quite naturally from domestic felicity to its wider communication, and first by repatriation. What is clearly exilic here? Before the reign of Ezechias, Juda herself had been the victim of partial deportations even to "the isles of the sea." Edomite and Philistine raiders (Am. 1:6-8,11-12; 2 Par. 28:17-18) had taken numerous prisoners whose final destination is clear enough in Joel 3:3-6. A greater *diaspora* was indeed to come long after Isaias' voice had been stilled; but "the dispersed of Juda" were already a mournful fact during his early lifetime; and the return of their posterity, or at least opportunity for it, belonged to an inviolable destiny.

A still more severe strain to historical perspective lies in the fancy that such predictions of restoration, originating in the Assyrian period, have been adapted later to "reflect the conditions and aspirations of the people of the exilic period," merely by borrowing from its viewpoint a slightly different style of expression. The situation of the Babylonian exiles at the beginning of Cyrus' rise to power was wholly without historical parallel. Already for half a century a suppressed alien element in Babylonian society, but still a coherent one, the now impending fall of their masters before a still remoter power seemed to threaten them with total submersion, national oblivion, and the final extinction of the Covenant beyond hope of recovery. To find among them the compiler of Isaias' prophecies, and at the same time imagine him as seeing in this desperate prospect only "slightly different conditions" from the worst adversities of Assyrian days, is to create an impossible character as the final redactor of the Book of Isaias. And yet the achievement of this anticlimax demands a sensibility so keen and nicely attuned that it can discern, in these promises of future restoration, the exact qualities of expression which mark them as editorial and not Isaian.

This reviewer has consciously emphasized what seem to him to be the chief points of exception in Dr. Kissane's work, for the very reason that he considers it decidedly helpful and stimulating in most of its features.

WILLIAM H. MCCLELLAN, S.J.

WILLIAM FOXWELL ALBRIGHT, *The Excavations of Tell Beit Mirsim*, Vol. III, The Iron Age (New Haven: The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research, Vols. XXI-XXII for 1941-1943). Pp. xxvi, 230; Plates 73.

With this volume, Dr. Albright concludes the technical account of the excavations made under his direction in 1926-1932 at Tell Beit Mirsim. Vol. I (1932) and Vol. IA (1933) were devoted to the pottery remains from the eight strata (J-C) of the Bronze Age, while Vol. II (1938) was given over to the consideration of the other Bronze Age material recovered. The present Vol. III (1943) is concerned with the two strata (B-A) of the Iron Age and covers the period of Israelite occupation. The volumes were written by a specialist for specialists, with careful documentation, plans, many photographic plates and good indices.

Although inscriptional proof is lacking, the available evidence points to Tell Beit Mirsim as the site of Debir (Kirjath-sepher), one of the Canaanite royal cities destroyed by the Israelites in their conquest of southern Palestine. Dr. Albright has definitely disposed of the claims advanced for ez-Zaheriyeh by his soundings at that site (See Appendix I). With no other site in the vicinity meeting the requirements,

he believes that the identification of Tell Beit Mirsim with the biblical Debir or Kirjath-sehper is highly probable.

The final destruction of the Canaanite Debir (city C of the excavations) took place, according to Dr. Albright, in the late thirteenth century B.C., or about the time that the neighboring city of Lachish fell. On the ashes of the city C, the Israelites built the city B, which passed through a pre-Philistine (B1), Philistine (B2), and a post-Philistine (B3) phase. It was fortified early in its third phase, very probably about 975 B.C. by David, and it was destroyed by the invading hordes of the Pharaoh Shishak in the fifth year of Jeroboam (about 918 B.C.).

Upon the ruins of B, the Israelites built the city A, which became a prosperous textile and dyeing center. Scores of basketfuls of loom-weights were recovered, and several dye-plants were found with their stone vats intact. The houses and shops were well-built. Many of them had an inner support of three or four stone pillars and an outer steps of stone leading to a second story. Toward the end of the eighth century B.C., the city A was partly destroyed, very probably by the Assyrians under Sennacherib in the summer of 701 B.C. It recovered slowly during the next century, but suffered again when the Chaldeans came in 598 B.C. to put down the rebellion of Joiakim. At this time the fortifications were demolished, but the rest of the city escaped destruction. Nine years later, the Chaldeans returned and practically annihilated what was left. It was never rebuilt. Such seems to be the story of Iron Age Tell Beit Mirsim as reconstructed by Dr. Albright from its ruins.

A valuable feature of Vol. III is the fourth chapter, contributed by Dr. J. L. Kelso and D. J. Palin Thorley. It describes the potter's technique as exemplified at Tell Beit Mirsim and is "the first detailed technical analysis and evaluation of any pottery excavated in the Near East." A point for those interested in Old Testament chronology is the long note on page 37, in which Dr. Albright arrives at the approximate date of 922 B.C. for the division of the Kingdom, 918 B.C. for the Shishak's invasion, and 879 B.C. for that of Ben-hadad.

While there were no sensational discoveries in any of the strata, the excavations at Tel Beit Mirsim did definitely advance our knowledge of Palestinian antiquity. It is hoped that Dr. Albright may direct another campaign at the site to round out the picture.

E. A. CERNY, S.S.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD, *Palestinian Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known through Literature* (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1943). Pp. 100. $1.75.

In most of the major excavations in Palestine, small terra cotta figurines and plaques of a nude female figure have been found in strata ranging from the Middle Bronze to the Early Iron Age (2000-600 B.C.).

The author of this study catalogues several hundred of these objects according to their form and compares them with similar objects from neighboring countries. Believing that there may be some connection with cult practices, he carefully examines the literature and the inscriptions of the period for references to Asherah, Ashtart and Anat, the principal goddesses worshipped in the region. The work is well done, but the results are negative. What these figurines were used for, remains a mystery.

E. A. CERNY, S.S.

SHOLEM ASCH, *The Apostle* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1943). Pp. VIII, 804. $3.00.

On the last page of this book the author in a prayer of thanksgiving states that this book as well as *The Nazarene* are to be taken as one work written for "the merit of *Israel.*" The theme of *The Apostle,* its purpose and development will remain completely unsatisfactory, because its essential historical framework has been deliberately altered, distorted, and falsified.

Asch proposes that the congregation newly formed by the original Apostles, as rabbinical teachers, with a faith in Jesus exclusively as their Messias, was indeed only a Jewish sect. It was, however, Paul, who by his preaching of Jesus as the *Son of God* and demanding His adoration formed an entirely distinct congregation of Messianists composed chiefly of Gentile converts; the myth of Jesus' supernatural conception and birth is to be found further in Luke's Gospel, which received the explicit approval of the Apostle.

The purpose of the book is to illustrate that Pharisaic Judaism never opposed, but rather strenuously defended the preaching of the original Apostles and their newly formed sect of Messianists, and that the insurmountable gap between the Jews and the Gentiles was caused by none other than Paul, who established a new type of Messianism. This defense of Pharisaic Judaism is developed by stressing the utter corruption of the sacerdotal or Sadducean party and the House of Annas, and, on the other hand, the benevolence of Rabban Gamaliel ben Simon, Rabbi Jochanan ben Zachai, Reb Sabbatai Zadoc of Rome and others towards the early Christians, inclusive of Paul.

Accepting the antiquated tendency theory of the Tübingen School, Asch believes that there were two types of Christian believers from the beginning.

The Jewish sect of Messianists at Jerusalem is called *Ebionim* (i.e., Ebionites, who incidentally only appear in the second century as a Jewish Christian sect). At their meeting for "the breaking of the bread" the members of the sect act as if they were attending a seance and this meeting ends with Peter taking the part of a Holy Roller. *Rabbi Simon bar Jonah* (Peter) is the formal head of this sect. He cures

the lame man in the temple by some sort of hypnotic power, and the ascribing to him of miraculous powers is legendary. Since he was not strong in the law, but lived by faith, he always needed someone to lean on, so that after the death of James the Less he drew near to Paul, "What did this or that interpretation of the faith signify by comparison with the responsibility which now lay on him"? (p. 677). The Essenian *Rab Jacob ben Joseph* (James the Less), who is assumed to be the son of Mary and Joseph and the brother of Jesus, is the spiritual head of these Jewish Messianists. He had his misgivings about the teaching of Paul, whose doctrine of the divinity of Jesus remained unintelligible to him. Not only does he forbid Paul from addressing the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem but he also chides him for daring "to lift up the ax against the roots of Israel."

Another type of Christianity is developed by Asch. It represents the Pauline party or Gentile Christianity. In his treatment of the Apostle of the Gentiles the author pours out his venom to besmirch the life and character of Paul. He is described as being harsh, overbearing, and obstinate, with an incomplete Jewish schooling and a smattering of Greek education. The Apostle is said to be constantly subjected to malarial fever and is forever falling into ecstasies, trances, convulsions or fits—the author avoids using the word epilepsy—during which time Paul sees visions upon which he depends for divine guidance and after which he always loses the power of sight for a time; into this preconceived notion the vision of Paul on his way to Damascus is placed. Asch, also, has the Apostle become an idolator in Arabia shortly after his conversion, and Paul is made to indulge in the shameful orgies of dancing, music, and drunkenness; on other occasions the Apostle does not hesitate to attend the abominations of the idols. After his conversion Paul is said to have reached of his own accord the conclusion that Jesus was not only the Messias but also the *Son of God;* this teaching of the Apostle created a storm amongst the Christians of Damascus and remained unintelligible to both Peter and James; but this doctrine made further progress in Rome, when Paul declared that adoration was due to Jesus the Messias and Son of God. Since his doctrine was unacceptable to the Jewish Messianists, Paul opened his own prayer house at Corinth and was responsible for the birth of the Church; through his journeys he now established his own Church. Shortly after the death of James the two bitterly opposing factions of Christianity are finally united through the union of Peter and Paul shortly before their death in Rome.

The Apostle is an infectious mixture of fact, fiction, and legend. It represents a sad, wretched, and distorted picture of Christian origins.

JOHN E. STEINMUELLER.

LAVAL LAURENT, O.F.M., *Aventures Apostoliques*, Les Actes des Apôtres (Quebec: Franc. Miss., 1942), Pp. 127. 10 sous

The above work of translation is a splendid effort to popularize the oft-forgotten Acts of the Apostles. It is designed principally to acquaint the faithful with this portion of the Scriptures, to encourage its reading, study and application of its lessons to daily life.

To achieve his purpose Father Laurent has employed many means. He has rendered a smooth and easy reading of the text by adapting the original Greek to current French language and idiom. By the process of condensation he has removed much of the cumbersomeness of lengthy Greek clauses which introduce many of the passages.

The translator has happily inserted throughout the Acts, where necessary for identity of the characters, proper names in place of the personal pronoun. Thus, he leaves his reader in constant touch with personages as the scenes or action change.

Brief, pithy explanatory notes found on each page sufficiently complement the thought of the reader. The entire text is conveniently set off into topical passages. Illustrations and a handy map enhance the entire work.

We believe the *Aventures Apostoliques* points to what might be done with other individual or groups of books of the Scriptures. The possibilities are manifold when one considers the art that has entered into book-making. Such individual volumes could become the necessary stimulus for the building-up of an extensive Scripture-reading laity. In this regard Father Laurent's work is stimulating.

W. J. GALUS, C.R.